

2

# BABEL no BETHEL.

*That is,*

The Church of *Rome* no true visible  
Church of CHRIST.

In answer to *Hugh Cholmley's* Challenge, and  
*Rob: Butterfields* Maschil, two masculine  
Champions for the Synagogue  
of *Rome*.

By H. B. Rector of *St. Matthews* Friday-street.

---

JUDGES. 6. 31.

Whyee plead for Baal? Will yee save him? If hee be a God,  
let him plead for himselfe, because one hath cast downe his  
Altar.

Tertullian: adversus Hermogenem, liber.

Hermogenes loquacitatem, facundiam existimat: Et impuden-  
tiam, constantiam deputat: Et maledicere, officium bonae  
conscientiae iudicat? Sed videris persona, cum doctrina  
mihi quaestio est.

Bernard. Epist. 190. de Abailardo.

non iustius os loquens talia fustibus tenderetur, quam  
rationibus refelleretur?

Aug. contra Iulianum Pelagianum.

non ipsum calami sui amentum, erubescendo converte-  
retur in minimum?

---

Printed for M. S. 1629.

BABELED BETHEL

The Church of Rome no more visible

in answer to the challenge and  
of the church of Rome  
Chapman for his dogmatic  
of Rome

James A. Smith  
The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints  
in answer to the challenge and of the church of Rome

Translation of the Book of Mormon  
into English, French, German, Italian, Spanish, and Swedish  
by James A. Smith

Published by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints  
in answer to the challenge and of the church of Rome

And comes with many Testaments  
in answer to the challenge and of the church of Rome

40:69





*To be High and Honourable Court*  
of Parliament now by Gods mercy assembled, the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsell and consent,  
*the spirit of zeale & courage for CHRIST*  
and his Truth be multiplied.



*Of Sacred Senate,*  
Sith it hath pleased  
God of his mercy to  
re-assemble you in  
these deplored times,  
as a great Colledge of  
wise Physicians, to consult  
how our corruptions  
may be cured:  
what cause haue we all  
to lesse his Name, and to pray for his blessing vpon  
yeherein? Nor may we forget to giue him thanks  
foyour last meeting, wherein God put into the  
heart of our gracious King to put to his Sovereigne  
led to the healing of an importat symptom. Now  
enough it be a rule of the Physicians, that the inuening  
of the method in healing doth often require  
a discale: yet they agree, that sometimes a Sym-  
me requires present remedy, before the discale be  
cured with. This your wisdoms observing, you  
happily

*The Epistle Dedicatorie.*

happily began with the Symptome; and now remains the maine disease to bee cured, which is, the State of Religion. And Religion being the Soule, and the Republicke the Body, the Soules distemper (wee hope) will the more easily be cured, after the disordered humours of the body are rectified, and the predominant peccant purged; the Soule following the temperature of the body, as saith the Philosopher. Nor need your religious wisdomes to take your rules elsewhere, eyther for the necessity, or due manner of reforming religion, then from Gods word. Yet it is the obseruation euen of the Politicia himselfe, that whatsoeuer Princes and Common-wealths desire to preserve themselves, they must first of all

12. "things haue a speciall care of the well ordering of  
"true Religion; nor canst thou haue (saith he) anore  
"certaine signe of the ruine of Religion, then when  
"thou seest Gods worship despised and contemned;  
"therefore such must be cheefly carefull, that the foundations of religion be kept safe and sound in good  
"reparation, if they would haue theyr citizes or  
"subiects well affected and inclined to imbrace concord. And if this so diligent care of Gods worship  
"had beene obserued of christian Magistrates (saith  
"he) according to the first diuine institution wee  
"should haue inioyed farre greater happines and  
"peace in the Christian world, So he. And whe did the state of Religion in our land cry lowder for re-  
"purgation, then now? The babylonish aduersities were neuer more insolent; more confident. And by  
"not? Haue they not found Aduocates enoug in  
"our Church to plead their cause? Witnesse yo  
"Pamphlets lately published with priuiledge, there  
"by

*Machiavel. Disc.  
pnt. lib. 1. cap.*

*The Epistle Dedicatorie.*

by *Hugh Cholmley*, the other by *Robert Butterfield*. Such base bookes, written by professed Protestant Ministers, and that, of the Church of England, no age euer produced, much lesse patronized in this our State, since the reformation of our Religion established, till within the memory of Children of 7. yeares, in which space what bookes haue domineered and revelled among vs, but such as maintaine eyther the Arminian heresie, or the Antichristian Apostacie? Besides the abundance of Popish bookes transported hither from beyond the Seas, to the infinite damage of simple chapmen, which are bought and sould without checke or controule.

Now for the Arminian heresie, none was euer more damnable, none more repugnant to the grace of the Gospell, directly vndermining and ouerturning Gods eternall free grace in electing and predestinating vs vnto saluation, as also the powerfull worke of his grace in our effectuall vocation and conuersion, and perseuerance therein vnto glory. Which damnable heresies ere now had been beaten to dust, or pressed to death, if the presses might haue had faire play. In the meane time the fautors and authors of them goe prettily on, to keepe their heresies on foot. For at this present there is a profest Arminian booke already printed, hauing lyen a pretty while in the decke, not daring as yet to come abroad, which the feare of some Paliament-storm, like a spring frost keepes backe from putting forth the leaues. So little hope is there of the curing of this creeping gangrene, or fretting Cancer, if this Sacred Senate take not the surer order to prevent their ouerspreading of the most noble Church and Sate in the world.

For the Antichristian Apostacie, the Romish Synagogue is maintained tooth and nayle to be a true visible Church.



*The Epistle Dedicatorie.*

Church. Which if it were by Iesuites we should not merveil: but the mischief is, it is by our own protest Ministers. And it should seem (I craue pardon, if I mistake) as though there were some secret plott, which all the world knowes not, for the reducing either of Popery into *England*, or *England* to Popery, or at least reconciling vs together vpon some indifferent termes. For Mr. *Cholmley* hath intimated so much in his Epistle Dedicatorie to his reuerend Diocesan, where speaking reproachfully of me (as his constant manner is throughout his booke) for writing to against the Church of Rome, he saith, *He hath not only shamed himself, but put vs all out of order, hindered our good proceedings &c.* But what hee meaneth by his order, and good proceedings, I leaue to the iudiciall examination of your wisedomes.

And the suspicion is the stronger as being nourished by a continuall current, that so mettrily driues the Popish mills about, and sets ours in a back water or float. Being therefore prouoked, not only by the cause it selfe, so full of moment, and for the sauing of poore simple soules, easily either tolled into Romes Net, or the faster intangled in their hunters toyle, who soeuer graze within that pale: but also by way of challenge from these champions for Babel: I haue in this small Treatise (worthy of a farre abler pen) fully cleared (I hope) and evidently concluded the vniuersall Romish Synagogue to be no true visible Church of Christ, but the Apostate Synagogue of Satan and Antichrist, wherein by the established doctrine and faith thereof, no saluation is to be found, and therefore ought to be abandoned of all, that seeke for saluation by Christ. I haue among other vnanswerable Arguments, together with the remouall of all the maine obiections to the contrary, clearly prooued, that

*The Epistle Dedicatorie.*

That the Papall Synagogue hath no true and lawfull ordination, or Ministeriall Calling, according to Christs institution, so as all their sacrificizing shaueling Priests, are but a rabble of Antichrists Factors and Vsurers, a company of soule-cheaters, heauen-robbbers, quack-salvers, and mountebanks, purse-pickers, and imposters, hate-treachers, troublers, and betrayers, meere prophane and destroyers of the sacred calling.

Wherefore my humble suite in the name of Iesus Christ, to this Sacred Senate is, that there may not be left one Idolatrous Masse-monger or Iesuite in this Church, Court, or Country. Thus should all Popish Idols fall to ground, hauing neuer a shauē sacrificer left to support them, or by such puppet Idols to supplant their blind adorers to their eternall destruction. And consider yee graue sages, what a horrible sinne it is to suffer any one Idol wittingly & willingly to be exalted against Christ in this our Itael. Is it not a high dishonour to God, a prouocation of his jealousy against this whole Land? Haue we prospered in any enterprize, since we haue permitted Romes Gods to roost among vs? And can wee expect better, but euen to bee vtterly consumed, and rooted out, if they be not pact away the sooner? Again, what a fearefull sinne is it for vs to become voluntary Accessories to others damnation? And are we not so, while we suffer popish Idolaters, euen vnder our noses, and roofes, to perish in their damnable Idolatries? For what Protestant, yea or they that thus plead for Rome, but confesse, that an Idolatrous Papist, without Repentance, cannot be saued? If so, why do we suffer them to liue and dye in their Idolatry? Or is it not Idolatry? Will any man now make question of it, for which so many holy Martyrs of Christ lost their liues? Or  
hath

*The Epistle Dedicatorie.*

hath it been so formerly, & is it not so now? Is it any whit refined? Is it not as grosse and damnable now as euer it was? Or was euer Heathen Idolatry so grosse as it? For Gods sake therefore, joyne hearts and hands to the purging of the Court, Citie, Countrie, and euery corner of the Land of all popish Priests and Idols. Let not a rag of Romish trumperie be left, to seperate vs from our God, to the insatuating of our Counsels, the cowardizing of our English spirits, the ruinating of our State, and Religion, and the betraying of our selues and the neighbouring Churches, (while we proue to be the Egyptian Reed, which hurteth not, vnlesse leaned vpon, or trusted vnto) to become a prey to the Romish Dragon, or Spanish Eagle. And our Church and State thus pugged, be the Soueraigne head of this Senate intreated by the whole body, for a publike weekly fast & humiliation for the reuiving of our Couenant with God, neuer to be broken againe. For certeinly great is the wrath that is gone out against this Land. Vve haue hitherto but playd the Hypocrites in our Fasts, while our abominable & crying sins, Romish Idols, Iesuites and Priests, and other abominations are still with vs vn-cast out. And you know, that such were the finnes of *Manasses* (who filled Ierusalem with innocent blood, and Idols) as howsoeuer himselfe vpon his true humiliation was receiued to mercy, yet neither his reformation, nor *Iosias* purgation of religion after him, were of force to recover Gods fauor or to preuent the *Babylonia* captiuitie; so indeleble is the staine of innocent blood, shed, or betrayed, whether of the bodies of Gods people by cruell treacherie, or of their soules by crooked Idolatry. Yet, as *Ezechias* said, *let there be peace in my dayes*; so let vs pray for the peace of our Ierusalem, labouring to establish it,



*The Epistle Dedicatorie.*

as good King EZACHIAS, ASA, and IOSIAS did, by reforming and repurging Religion. So may wee recover our strength, and prosper, and regaine our English credit, now shamefully trampled vnder our enemies insulting foot. But till wee haue done thus, neuer let vs looke to prosper, but to be made the *taile*, and not the *head*. Yea can the Church of England looke backe to Sodome, and not bee turned into a pillar of Salt, senselesse in it selfe, but tart to the beholders? Remember LOTS wife. Or if AMASIAH, silence AMOS in *Bethel*, can hee with Idolatrous Israell expect any other, but desolation? And are not the Heavens astonished to behold the stupor of such, as should cry out against *Bethels* Altar? What's the reason? Surely an Idoll (as the Romish Dagon) is like the fish *Torpedo*, which but touched with the end of a staffe, stupifieth him that holds it. VVee cannot behold Romes Idols with the least assent, or silent conniueance, but wee are made like to the Idoll it selfe, hauing *Eyes and see not, mouths, and speake not*. This was that, for which the Lord called the Prophets *dumbe dogs*, and *Idoll shepheards*.

But did not SALOMON the wisest King tolerate Idolatrie in the skirts of his Court? True. But was this a point of his wisdom? Yea, was it not the Devils policie by this meanes to bring that glorious Kingdome (as all others) to ruine? What got SALOMON at length? Was not his peaceable Kingdome for this very cause pusht at by three potent enemies at once? Was not SALOMON saine to come home againe by weeping Crosse? And left hee not a Sonne, borne of an Ammonitish woman, who

*The Epistle Dedicatorie.*

by his inflexibilitie, animated by his younger Counsellors (so hastening the doome vpon his fathers sinne, and his owne, treading in his steps) lost, irrecoverably tenne parts of his Kingdome at a clap? And what Christian kingdomes, following such steps, but may justly expect the like fatall issue? And if any other, wee most of all, liuing so long vnder the very meridian of the Gospell.

Againe, bee this Sacred Senate humbly intreated, that a more strict and effectuall order may bee taken, for the repressing of such lawlesse libertie in the publishing of such bale bookes, as now haue filled our Church with schismes, and our Land with factions; such as necessarily exclude the orthodox bookes from hauing priuiledge for the Presse; for how should the Licensers bee *ambi dextri*? To whom wee can but offer our bookes and bee denied license: it being familiar to deny those bookes license, which (as they alledge) touch vpon Controuerfies, and crosse theyr owne opinions, while the Arminian and Popish defendants passe currant. And that for very shame, the Truth may not bee suppressed or silenced for Heresie sake; as once the Arrians desired of CONSTANTINE the suppressing of the mention of *Homonios*, which suppression the Orthodox Bishops protested against: or as the Arminian Remonstrants of late obtained of theyr Magistrates against the true Protestant Ministers in the *Low Countries*. God forbid, wee should thus skin ouer the festered sore; or to diuide the true mothers liuing child with her, that had ouer-laid her owne; or tye the liuing man face to face to the dead: or with BALACK, when hee could

*The Epistle Dedicatorie.*

could not preuaile by cursing, to bid B A L A A M neither blesse nor curse, which not euen the couetous Prophet would or durst obey, but went on to blesse Gods people. And God forbid our Prophets should proue worse then B A L A A M. But the word of God is not bound. And rather then it should bee bound, or muzzeled, if all the band-dog heresies of hell were let loose, to fight it out; wee should bee sure that Truth at length would put all her gaine-sayers to silence; who otherwise will easi'y preuaile.

And now most noble Senate, if in a stormy and rocky Sea, I haue so farre aduentured my boat to rescue from wracke many ignorant Passengers, (who might perish, without waiting to the right Port) as in the meane time I proue like *Ionas*, cast into the sea for the safetie of the Ship: Yet my trust is, that my God will prouide a Whale, or a Graue, wherein I shall not see this goodly Church and State vndermined by a Crew of Romish Pioners. Thus casting my selfe at the feet of this Sacred Senate, humbly crauing pardon for my boldnesse, and praying God to make this the most happie Parliament, that euer yet was in England, I rest

*The most humble servant  
of this most Hon: Senate.*

HENRY BURTON.



could not prevent by cunning, to bid Balaam cry-  
out blasphemous words, which not even the con-  
science would or durst obey, but went on to blas-  
pheme. And God forbid our Prophets should  
be so wicked. But the word of God is  
not bound. And rather than it should be bound, or  
unwieldy, it is the hand of God that will be  
loose, to fight for us; we should be sure that Truth  
at length would put all her gainsayers to silence; who  
otherwise will only prevail.

And now will noble Scars, if in a stormy and rocky  
sea, I have not been advanced, I have not been  
washed in the blood of Christ, (who is the only  
without which we cannot be saved) as the same time  
I prove like a wall, cast into the sea for the sake of the  
Ship: Yet my trust is, that my God will provide a  
Whale, or a Crane, where I shall see his goodness.  
Church and State undermined by a Crew of Rotten  
Pirates. Thus casting my self at the foot of this Sa-  
cred Scars, simply craving pardon for my boldness,  
and praying God to make this the most happy Parli-  
ament that ever yet was in England, I rest

The most humble servant  
of this most Honorable

Henry Buxton

To the right Reuerend Father  
in God, the Lord Bishop of  
EXON.

Right Reuerend,



Being prouoked and assaulted by two Antagonists, who out of some strange zeale, (whether against the cause I propugne, or towards your Lordshp I iudge not) haue heated the furnace of their indignation seven times hotter then ordinary to force me bow to the Image of their exalted imagination: I thought it my duty, before I enter the lists, to addresse my selfe to your Lordshp, not fearing to choose your selfe for Vmpire, whom they haue so deeply ingaged (as I suppose they thinke) in their quarrell. Not that I take advantage of the offence they haue iustly giuen you in the soule cariage of the cause, if equally and vnpartially weighed: but chiefly trusting to your ingenuity and integritie of iudgement, when once you haue heard both parties. But first let me craue pardon of your Lor: in case (in a cause so important, as I conceiue) any one drop (in the pouring out of those Vials) hath distilled from my pen, which might (for the more praise sake) deserue the sponge. Homo sum, humani a me nil alienum puto. This is the comfort of my conscience, that the thing I mainly aimed at, was Gods glory, the honor of our Mother Church, and the saluation of simple and vnsable soules, who are the more easily either tolled on board, or retained vnder hatches in Peters ship (as they falsly call it) therein to run a desperate bazard of inevitable shipwracke, when they haue the warrantie of some of our owne Pilots to perswade them, that they ride Peters ship, wherein they may safely arriue at the holy Land. And that I speake not at Randone, witnesse a Recusant of

late, with whō a Minister of London being called to confer (& he told it me him selfe) the Recusant at first dash will'd him set his heart at rest, for (qd. hee) the best in your Church confesse ours a true Church, wherein saluaton is to be found; which we deny to your Church, and therefore we are on the surer side.

Page 25.

But I hope your Lordships owne words in your Reconciler, will a little qualifie and abate such insolence (though Papists are apt enough to reply, Thy brother Benhadab) where you say, They are of the visible Church, such as it is; what is this, but to say, they are neyther Iewes, nor Turkes, nor Pagans, but misbelceuers damnably hereticall in opinion; shametully Idolatrous in practise. Yea let your Lordships owne inference upon Zanchies Markes of a true visible Church of Christ (anowed by all Protestants) for euer stop Recusants mouthes, and dash Protestant pens or pen-cells, for euer after painting the strumpet with the naue colours of the true spouse; to wit, If we bring the Romane Church to this touch (pag. 15.) shee is cast for a meere counterfeite; shee is as farre from truth, as truth is from falshood. So your Lordship in fine, if your Episcopall cares can dispense with the perrisall of this poore labour of mine, I trust you shall find, that I haue followed your truly Episcopall counsell in your Reconciler, by turning my sword into a sickle, to cut downe the ranke of their corruption of the Romish Synagogue, and any speare into a matocke, to dig downe the walls of great Babylon, so as, I trust your Lordship and all men shall see the fall of this controuersie lying buried in Babels ruinous heape, whence I hope none will offer to rake it out, and set it on foote againe. Thus craving pardon for my boldnesse, and humbly taking leaue of your L<sup>o</sup>p. I rest, deprecating the name of an aduersarie, but desiring to performe to your Lordship all offices, in the power of

Your Lordships poore younger brother  
and Seruant in Christ.

HENRY BAYTON



To Mr. H V G H C H O L M L E Y, Rector of the  
Portion of *Clare*, in the Parish of *Tyverton* in *Devon*:  
H. B. Rector of *St. Mathews Friday Street London*,  
wisheth more sound Knowledge, more sin-  
cere loue of the Truth, more zeale  
for C H R I S T, and lesse for  
*Antichrist*.

**M**After C H O L M L E Y, when I read your  
Epistle to mee, and then your Booke,  
what a disparitie I found? In the one  
me thought I heard the mild voyce of  
*Jacob*, but in the other, I am sure I felt  
the rough hands of *Esaú*. So that I  
began to muse, whether you were a *Jacob* counterfeiting  
*Esaú*, or rather an *Esaú* counterfeiting *Jacob*. Whether-  
soeuer, thinke you by this meanes to procure your Mo-  
thers blessing, as He his Fathers? But that which made  
mee most to muse, was, how it was possible, that such  
a one, as Mr. *Cholmley*, should write such a booke, whe-  
ther wee consider the matter or the style. For the style,  
or language of it, I tooke it to bee some Iesuities, some  
Eudemon's, or Cacodæmon's, or the like: and that it  
was not possible for an Israelite to plow with so sharpe a  
share, vnlesse hee had borrowed a Philistins file. And  
for the matter, I wondred as much, how it was pos-  
sible for an ancient, painefull, laborious Minister of  
the Church of England, euery way equall (at least) in  
his Ministeriall labours and studies (as you say of your  
selfe) to *Henry Burton*, to take vp the bucklar in such  
a quarrell. Surely if you had not told vs what

a painefull Minister you are; I confesse I should haue taken you for one that perhaps formerly had bene painefull and industrious in your Ministerie, but falling from that to ease, from a Bee to a Drone, from a weckely preaching to a monethly Sermon, and so, from your first loue; God had hereupon taken your graces from you, and giuen you up to squander away the remnant of your reason and judgement, and other naturall parts in so shamefull a cause, as instead of being a builder of Sion, to become a cobler vp of the wast ruines of forlorne Babylon. But you doe it to vindicate the cause of your reuerend Diocesan. I am sorry you should instead thereof so much dishonour him. For in stead of vindicating him, who denieth the Church of Rome to be an Orthodox or true believing Church; you, forgetting your selfe, and him too, fall to vindicate the Church of Rome, and to proue it to be an Orthodox Church. So that what you haue affirmed of the Church of Rome in defence of the Councell of Trent all along; the Reader will be ready to take all your assertions for your reuerend Diocesans. Wherein what fouler aspersion can result vpon his reuerend person? But in the first front of your Epistle Dedicatorie you disclaime pleading for Baal, or for Babel, and you say, *Let Babel pleade for her selfe*. But your practise altogether crossing your pretence, proues the Proverbe true, *Fronti nulla fides*. Wherein you doe as I haue read of a corrupt Iudge, whose fashion was, when hee had a purpose to helpe out a man in his bad cause, to fall foule vpon him with sharpe language, which was but an Item to his Client to lay the heauyer fee in his lighter scale. Neyther doe I belieue the report to be true, that you are already rewarded with a Prebend for this your good seruice. But if you had fit still, and



Epistle.

let Babel plead for her selfe, you might haue deserved more thanks, and that I dare say, from your reuerend Diocesan.

But tell me, I pray you, how you came so easily to get your Plea for Babel licensed for the Presse. *Ab initio non fuit sic.* Surely if *Philoxenus* the Poet had beene the Examiner, he would haue done with yours, as hee did with the Tragedie, which *Dionisius* sent to him for his approbation, who sent it backe to him scored and cancelled quite through, as being all naught. *Vna Litura potest.* And whereas you call it an vnworthy *Defence of seaven dayes*, *Apelles* might answer you, as hee did the brag-painter, when he shewed him his goodly picture of a dayes painting, *I thought no lesse*, quoth *Apelles*. And for ought I know, you may spend Seuen yeares in such a defence, and be neuer the neerer, for all you call mee a Braggadochio. And when I saw in what little request your and Mr. *Butterfields* bookes were, and that worthily, I could not easily resolute to thinke them worthy of an answer. Yet seeing the cause to be very important and being challenged by you, I resolved to answer you, obseruing the Counsell of *Salomon*, *Prou. 26. 4. 5.* I haue answered you, that you should not applaud your selfe in your opinion: and so answered, as I might not be like vnto you. For I passe by all your Contemptuous and reproachfull language, as imputing it, to a *κακοζήλεια*, necessarily attending that pen, that vndertakes the defence of such a cause. So that I might compare your writing, as *Tertullian* doth Heretikes, to the *sepia*, a kind of Fish, who least they bee taken of theyr pursuers, cast behind them abundance of blacke matter, and so escape out of sight. But it may please God to giue you repentance for such a soule worke as this, so full of blacke matter; that

\*\*\*

so



*Epistle.*

so *deposito animositate contradicendi, quæ tamen omnes, qui veritate Dei vinci nolunt, & sua perversitate vincuntur*, As *August.* speaks, you may acquit your selfe for a good Christian. And remember, Master *Cholmley*, you haue past your solemne word to me; for your words are, *If you can (say you) soundly and substantially convince me of untruth, I professe before God and the world, that I will yeeld unto you, without any more adoe; being already willing to be overcome of the truth in this cause* (they bee your owne words) and thereupon I claime your promise, hauing not disclaimed the match on this condition, vpon so good witnesses, as *God* and the *world*. And I hope you haue not vttered this protestation, on the outside of a presumption of the goodnesse of your cause, and the strength of your art and wit in handling it, and on the other, out of a preiudicate opinion of the weakenesse of your Aduersary. You know, that the very contempt of an Aduersary, and presumption of a Captaines owne forces, hath lost him the field.

And it is not without cause, if I thus doubt, for you call all my Arguments *weake cauills*, and all your booke through you load me with vilifications extreamly. Now thus doing, you shall either abate the glory of your victory, or expose your selfe to the greater hazards of disgrace, if overcome. Or if you presumed my reply would not find a passe, and so you might fight the more securely without an Aduersary: you know that truth seekes no corners, nor will easily be baffled; and besides, hauing to deale (if it be true as you say) with a man of a contentious humour, you might well suspect the worst.

But before I enter the lists with you, I pray you resolve me of one thing in your *Dedication*, where you  
say

say, that in handling of this argument of the Church of Rome, I haue not onely shamed my selfe, but (say you) *put vs all out of order, hindered our good proceedings, &c.* What meane you by *vs all*? what, by *putting vs all out of order*? or what bee those *good proceedings* of yours, which I haue hindered? These speeches are to me Paradoxes, and Riddles. I hope there is no such *order*, or *good proceedings* a foot among *all you*, of whom ye speake as to re-erect and establish the Romish Baal againe in our land, for which you haue so doughtily pleaded. If that be your meaning, I cry you mercy, then haue I committed a sin of ignorance all this while, in putting you all out of *order*, and hindring your *good proceedings*. Pardon me this wrong, and henceforth I will not plead ignorance, but I will both professe my selfe an Adversary against such a faction, and will both by my penne, and with my tongue, and with my heart by earnest prayer to God, labor all I can to put you out of such *Order*, and to *hinder* and ouerturne all such *good proceedings*. And the Lord assist me more and more, and cheere vp his faithiull seruants euery where, euen his *called* and *chosen*, and *faithfull*, to maintaine the Lambs quarrell against the proud Wolfe, and beast of Babylon.

But doth not your Portion of *Clare* lye now at stake, and you ouer head and eares in a Premunire, for defending a point contrary to the stablished doctrine of the Church of England. Looke vpon the statute, and tremble, and resort as some of your betters haue giuen you a faire example.

What tell I you of your hazard of your portion of *Clare*, when you haue for your part not only imperilled so many poore soules of their portion of heauen,

*The Epistle Dedicatorie.*

who are apt to be scandalized by this your defence, but obdurate and obfirmed the hearts of Recusants to their further condemnation? You plead for the Church of Rome, and for your Reuerend Diocesan. But how can you so pleade for the one, and yet vindicate the honour of the other? The Lord open your eyes, and giue you grace to behold and bewaile what a just offence you haue giuen by your vnjust defence, which being suddenly done in seuen dayes space, will require seuen yeeres repentance. You must pardon my zeale; it is (for all your scoffs; and so you shall find it) for God, and for his Church. But for particular and personall wrongs you load me withall, I haue laboured to digest such hard morsels with the stomacke of Christian patience, which otherwise to flesh and blood, had not bene very easie to ouercome.

*Your brother in CHRIST, but  
profest adversary in the cause  
of Antichrist.*

H. B.

---



H. BURTON TO MR. ROB: BUTTERFIELD,  
 wisheth more ripenesse of yeares, and more  
 soundnesse of judgement, before hee doe  
 any more handle such deepe  
 Controuersies.

**M**After BUTTERFIELD, lee not your  
 inuenittie insults, that I answer your  
 Latine Elegancie with my English rusti-  
 citie. For it would not be a Decorum in  
 mee to seeme to contend with you upon  
 all termes of paritie or correspon-  
 dence: Suffice it mee I haue not disdained to nominate  
 you in the quarrell. And though the Proverbe is, Ne  
 Hercules contra Duos: yet if there were three score  
 of you, in such a cause, I hope, through Gods helpe, I  
 might bee bold to cope with you all. I doe in this Booke  
 therefore, Vna fidelia duos parietes dealbare, as the  
 Proverbe is, white two walls with one brusb: the  
 substance of the Answer to your Maschil, you may find  
 all along in this to Master Cholmley's; wherewith I  
 hope both of you will rest satisfied.

Now for your Maschil, the stupendious title of your  
 Booke, you would seeme to instruct all the world that  
 you are an Hebrician, and that you had some young Pu-  
 pils to deale withall. But let mee tell you for your in-  
 struction, there is a Maschil, an Hebrew word, writ-

# Epistle.

10. 10 ten with the same letter 10, onely differing by a small  
 ptecke. Now when I consider your youth, and the  
 weight of the Argument which you attempt, Impar  
 viribus istis, and your eagerneſſe with the Printer to  
 play the midwife with all Speed to the bringing forth of  
 this your Infant; and what a dwarfe it is: me thinks  
 you should haue named the Child rather Maſchil, then  
 Maſchil; Maſchil ſignifying an Abortine, one borne  
 before the due time. And for Maſchil you might haue  
 kept it to your ſelfe, for your owne private uſe and bet  
 ter inſtruction, how to meddle in ſuch high matters.  
 But I ſpare you, onely take heed of building your hopes  
 upon ſuch a ſandie foundation. And abuſe not the good  
 giſſes God hath beſtowed vpon you to ſo baſe vſes.

Farewell.

To the Christian and Iudicious

Reader.

**C**hristian and iudicious Reader, our late learned Doctor Field in his Epistle Dedicatorie before his booke of the Church, saith; That there is no part of heavenly knowledge more necessary, than that which concerneth the Church. And a little after what is said of his titles, I referre to thy judgement, how suitable it may bee for these. The condition (saith he) of the times wherein we live is such, that many are discouraged from meddling with the controuersies of religion, because they are sure (besides the vile slanders, wicked Calumniationes, and bitter reproaches of the common aduersaries) to passe the censures of those men, who though they will doe nothing themselves, yet in the bright of a proud and disdainfull spirit, with many a scornfull looke, smile at the follies of other mens writings, as they esteeme them. Now if hee, a man of those eminent gifts, so complained of his times: what shall any interiour Minister, entring the lists of most important controuersies in these dayes, expect, but besides scornfull lookes, also vile slanders, wicked calumniationes, and bitter reproaches, and that not of the common aduersaries, as then, but of home bred friends, the Sons of our Mother? Nor doe I speake by guesse. I am not the first, though the least by many, that haue written, (but occasionally at first) at first to proue the Church of Rome no true visible Church of Christ: yet such is my hope to fall vpon that age, wherein I am the first, whom in this argument, euen mine owne brethren haue openly and keenely oppugned with fell weapon in hand. And if it were my person onely. which they tosse vpon their pens,



*To the Christian Reader.*

pens, tearing me in peeces with violent and bitter reproches, I could the better brooke it.

But such a cause as this, whereon depends the salvation or damnation of thousands of soules, I craue pardon if I cannot let it fall to ground. Wherein for my part, I feare not to expose my selfe to the vnpartiall judgement of the best learned, who shall easily determine on which side rest the *weake Cavils*, and *Sophistrie*, and on which, the best *Logicke*, and reasons. Wee liue not in such an ignorant Age, as cannot discern weene white and blacke, truth and errour. Men be not thinke to carry it away with big words, the ill weeds of a bad cause. *Proiecit ampullas, et sesquialia verba.* But I hasten to the matter. And now I beseech you, O judicious Reader, consider what I say, and the Lord giue thee understanding in all things.

**Farewell.**

---



Mr CHOLMLEY. THE  
STATE OF THE NOW ROMAN  
CHURCH. Pag. 1. &c.

Mr Cholmley begins his Defence, as Tertullus the Orator his accusation against Paul, *Ἐποημεν γὰρ τὸν ἀνδρᾶ τῶτον λοιμὸν* &c. *Wee have found this man a pestilent fellow* &c. And as he begins, so continues all along to the end as if more were to be reposed in reprochings, & villifyings of my person, then in his arguments against the cause. Thus begging a prejudice of the cause, by laying aspersions vpon my person. But for me, *Nec iudicium vereor, nec suspicor pra iudicium*: I feare not censure, not suspecting preiudice of the ingenuous iudicious Reader, who will measure the cause by Arguments, not the person by words. But let vs heare his proofes & beare his reproofes with patience.

Pag. 2.

He reduceth all my Sophistry to two heads: 1 *Begger* or *begging the question*: 2 *Disorder*, comparing my arguments to scroles shuffled together in a lottery port. For the first, the cause I maintaine, is not so poore, as that I need in his sense begge for it. Although (such a hard world it is) a man may long maintaine such causes before it will make him rich. Such advocates may liue and die beggers, for ought I know. For the second, let him draw blindfold where hee will, and he shall haue good lucke if hee hit vpon euer a blanke among all my arguments; though *Andaces fortuna iuuat*.

A

But

M. Cholin-  
ley.

But how proues he my beggery? Thus: *The second Angel powered out his viall vpon the sea, and it became &c. Ergo, the Church of Rome is neither a true Church, nor a true visible Church. To which I may say farre better, then siffer said to Perkins, Apply Iohn Barber, and thou shalt haue a new paire of Sissers.*

*Reply.*

Beggers must put vp many wrongs, witnesse M Cholinleys Ergo here. yet he referres him to the judicious readers. So I: and then the judicious, yea vulgar reader shall finde no such things as Ergo here put. In the 7 vials pag. 21. any man may see how I illustrate and confirme my exposition of the second viall by the doctrine of Trent. M Cholinleys Ergo therefore concludes nothing for him; but rather giues occasion to the Reader, what to expect of him throughout his booke. And because this whole booke is so ouergrowne with the superfluity of maliciousnesse wherein lyeth most of his strength, I could wish hee would bestow the new Sissers vpon Iohn Barbar to clippe it off.

M. Cholin-  
ley. pag. 3.

But he addeth, *If I wrong him not, every man may see, that he beggeth two things &c.*

*Reply.*

But what if you doe wrong mee, as it is apparant ye doe? yet suppose ye wrong mee not: what bee thole two things I begge? Forsooth, *1 That an allegoricall Prophecie may be laid for a good foundation to frame an argument to decide a controuersie in Diuinity.*

I thought M Cholinleys Ergo, so falsely inferred or rather inforced vpon the premisses, could produce no better a conclusion. Hee offers violence, that would put the roote in place of the foundation. *Diruit, adificat.* Such builders may proue beggers in the end. And doth not M Cholinley bring the beggery vpon himselfe, while hee begges, nay boldly takes, before it be giuen him, such an Ergo? The sea  
(say



(say I) whereon the second viall is powred, is the doctrine of *Trent*. How proue I, or demonstrate that to be true? As there it is let downe by mee. Is this then, *The second viall powred out &c.* Ergo, *the Church of Rome no true Church?* Nay vice versa, the doctrines of *Trent* being such and such, as whereby the Church of *Rome* is declared to be no true Church: Ergo it is more then probable, that this is the meaning of the second viall.

But pag. 4. he sayth, I for my part cannot suppose it (to wit *M. Cholinley. Pag. 4.* the second viall) to be yet accomplished.

Reply.

A sound Argument: you suppose it not, Ergo it is not. Nor canne you suppose it, till you bee convinced that the Church of *Rome* is no true Church. What then? Will you then bee perswaded, that the second viall is powred out?

*The other point of his beggery is, that his owne private interpretation may bee allowed as the true meaning of the Holy-Ghost. &c.* *M. Ch. pag. 4.*

Reply.

I take the ground of my interpretation from Scripture, and therefore not private: and this interpretation proued by sufficient demonstration, why may it not bee allowed? But that is still the question. I must take heede of playing the importunate begger. *What if wee deny* (sayth *M. Cholinley*) *this interpretation, and put him to his prooves? Surely he is utterly disappointed, and all his building falls to the ground. Yea M Cholinley tollit subiectum questionis,* denies the interpretation, and prooves, and the accomplishment of the Prophecie it selfe.

But what hath *M. Colinley*, to disproue this interpretation? Yes, sayth he, pag. 5. *Because the ground of all is, that the Councell of Trent, or the doctrine there of are that bloody sea: I suppose it sufficient (if it be otherwise) to turne up all his phantasticall cavilation.*

*M. Ch. p. 5.*

## Reply.

Well: wee erect our best attention to this motion, as the maine *cardo* or hindege of the whole controuersie: only by the way the reader may note, that M<sup>r</sup> Chol<sup>l</sup> doth here acquit me of what but even now he accused me: for now the Doctrine of *Trent* is the ground of the vials interpretation, whereas before it was the ergo. But M. Cholinley proue the Councell of *Trent* otherwise, as he sayth, and I will confesse all that I haue sayd thereof is but *meere phantasticall canillation*. But if otherwise, I shall desire but *legem rationis*, that hee will bee content to leane the truth with mee, & his *phantasticall canillation* where he found it.

M. Cholin.

First therefore I proue it *ex praconcessis*: for he granteth  
 “ the same sea whereof (chap. 8. 8. ) the third part was  
 “ turned into blood, is here wholly turned therevnto. Now  
 “ *Brightman* (whom in this point he followeth) will haue  
 “ that third part of the sea to be the doctrine of *Europa*, the  
 “ third part of the Christian world, and then *est diuisionem*  
 “ the whole sea is the doctrine of the whole Christian  
 “ world: but the doctrine of the Councell of *Trent* is not  
 “ the doctrine of the whole Christian world: ergo it is not  
 “ the sea: here mentioned by *S<sup>t</sup> Iohn*.

## Reply.

Now surely if M. Cholinley did not trust more to his Sophistry then to his Logick, he would neuer thus argue. Either he must proue, that I so follow M. *Brightman*, as I altogether tye my selfe to his interpretation: as if I did *Iurare in verba Magistris*, as he is pleased to stile M. *Brightman*: or else his whole argument falls to ground, and pro-ueth a *phantasticall canillation*. And who sees not the proportion betweene the second Trumpet, and second vial? Of the second viall *Brightman* sayth, *Nunc Occidens sanguineis aquis plebitur: Iam Roma suae agenda partes erant*. Now the West is punished with bloody waters: now *Rome* was to play her part. But passe wee by this cavill to the next.

Second.



"Secondly: But I say, that the Councell of *Trent* hath M. Ch. p. 6.  
 "not a whit corrupted *Romes* doctrines, more then they  
 "were a long time before, Ergo the Councel of *Trents* con-  
 "clusions are not here to bee vnderstood. I need not take  
 "paines in the prooffe hereof: because the learned do not  
 "accuse it of this fault: but of loosening the world, in pro-  
 "mising a reformation: but instead thereof confirmed  
 "former corruptions of the Church. Only M. *Crawshaw*  
 "mentions one, namely their adding of Apochrypha to  
 "Canonicall Scripture; but that also is meant of confirma-  
 "tion, not of innouation.

*Reply.*

*I say*, sayth hee. *Ipse dixit*, is sufficient. But what if the  
 Councell of *Trent* hath onely confirmed those for generall  
 doctrines to be believed and receiued of all which before  
 were but particular opinions in that Church, which all  
 men were not tyed of necessity to receiue and belieue, but  
 were contradicted of many. To confirme that now to be *de*  
*iure & de fide*, to be a rule of faith, which before was onely  
*de facto* in practise among them, and that among some one-  
 ly, is this no corruption? But this (by M. *Cholinleys* owne  
 confession) was done by the Councell of *Trent*. Was it  
 ever held a generall doctrine of that Church, that Con-  
 cupiscence was no sinne? And yet that blasphemous Coun-  
 cell, expressly, and namely against the Apostle, decrees it  
 to bee no sinne. I might instance in many particulars  
 more, as in the point of justification, of saving faith, of the  
 Priests intention, and the like. But especially of the rule of  
 faith. M. *Cholinley* cites only his old friend M. *Crawshaw*,  
 telling of the addition of the Apochrypha to the Chanoni-  
 call Scriptures. But hath he neuer read the late reuerend  
 B. of *Chichester* Dr *Carleton* his learned booke *de Ecclesia*,  
 wherein he sheweth excellently how the rule of faith was  
 first altered by the councell of *Trent*? And how? Not  
 onely by adding the Apochrypha, but all their falsly so cal-  
 led Apostolicall Traditions, & withall their Decretals, &c

Hanc concu-  
 piscentiam, quā  
 aliquando Apo-  
 stolus peccatū  
 appellat, Sancta  
 Synodus decla-  
 rat Ecclesiam  
 Catholicā nū-  
 quam intelle-  
 xisse peccatum  
 appellare &c.  
 Sess. 5. Decret.  
 de pecc. orig.



about all the authority of the Church, and the Oracle of the Popes brest. So as the Pope in his Bull calls those definitions of *Trent Constitutiones novas, new Constitutions*. And well he might. And whereas, before the Councell of *Trent*, many of the damnable doctrines therein concluded, were held *Pro & Con* among the Schoolemen: now the whole Clergie of that Hierarchy must sweare to receiue them as matters of faith, nor to bee questioned any more. And all this to be held so irrefragable, as it must stand, *Non obstantibus Constitutionibus, & ordinationibus Apostolicis, alijsq; in contrarium facientibus quibuscunque: Notwithstanding Apostolicke Constitutions, and Ordinances, and others to the contrary whatsoever*. Is not all this a whit to corrupt Romes doctrines, more then they were long before the Councell of *Trent*. Did not Pope *Innocent 3* in the Councell of *Lateran* being in a horrible corruption, even an abominable Idol into the Church, notwithstanding hee did but decree & ratifie Transubstantiation to be of all beleueed of necessity, which before that time had bin but arbitrary? The like may be sayd of the Councell of *Constance* Decree, of shutting out the Sacred Cup. But the Councell of *Trent* surpasseth in this kind all that went before it. So as *Calvin* in his Antidote against the Councell of *Trent* sayth, *Vix unus est versus, qui non aliquo notabili errore conspersus sit, & qui dissimulatione non ferat*: There is scarce one verse of it, which is not leauened with some notable error, and which cannot be dissembled. To conclude this, say, the Church of *England* should ratifie Armenian doctrines, now adaies published by priuate spirits and that with allowance and pretended to be the doctrines of our Church, & should make them her publicke doctrines, with what conscience (*M. Cholinley*) could you subscribe to her *Articles*?

But besides this, what can *M. Cholinley* say to the *Index Expurgatorius*, neuer hatched before that Councell of *Trent*, but by it invented, and by the Pope confirmed? But more of this anon. And to helpe all this, what sayth hee of the

the new and last order of the Iesuites, erected in the time of that Councell by the Pope? Did euer hell hatch such a miscreant & mischieuous brood, the most matchlesse and actiuest instruments to propagate & execute those *Trent* Decrees through all the Papall world.

But proceed wee to M<sup>r</sup> *Cholinleys* 3<sup>d</sup> argument.

“Thirdly, I say, that the Councell of *Trent* hath reformed *Romes* doctrine, and made it (at least in one point) M. *Cholin*.  
 “better then it was before: ergo it is not here to be understood. The point is this: That there is no naturall ability in a man to prepare himselfe for grace, & so no merit of congruity, in which regard *Stapleton* sayth, *Meritū ex congruo explosum est*: a point of no small moment in these dayes.

*Reply.*

M<sup>r</sup> *Cholinley*, as it seemeth, is willing rather to play small play, then to giue out. But I am sorry hee should lay downe his credit at stake, at such a game, wherein hee bewrayes such palpable ignorance. Or hath his loue and zeale to defend the Councell of *Trent*, and to oppose mee, cast a myst ouer his eyes? But for his better information I wish hee would read the history of the Councell of *Trent*, 2 booke. Also *Chemnitius* his *Examen* vpon the sixt Session of *Trent*; and if hee please, my booke of Iustification chap. 2. and my Plea to the Appeale, pag. 71. And for the present to satisfie the Reader in this point, it is a matter very remarkable to obserue the subtile dissimulation and hypocrisie of the Councell of *Trent* in this very point; wherein they carried themselves so cunningly in the setting of it downe (I meane the point of Merit before Iustification) that both *Vega* who held the merit of congruity before justification, and *Soto*, who opposed it, were both well pleased, as hauing both their opinions ratified by the Councell. For in some it was the Councels craft not once to name the Schoole-terms of congruity and condignity.



dignity, but to content themselves which the general word merit, which equiuocally might haue relation either to Congruity or condignity, and hereunto adding the equiuocall voice of grace, sometimes meant of the first grace, sometimes of the second: by this meanes the Councells decree became as a Delphicke oracle, to fit both *Vega* the franciscan, and *Soto* the Dominican. And yet to make it cleare to all judicious eyes, that the Councell of *Trent* hath not abrogated but confirmed the *Merit of Congruity*: note the Councells words, the title of the 5 chapter, Sess. 6. *De necessitate &c.* Of the necessity of preparation to justification. And cap. 5. *ad conuertendum se &c.* to convert themselves to their justification. But especially cap. 7. *Iustitiam in nobis recipientis &c.* receiuing righteousness in our selues, or being iustified by inherent righteousness every one according to his measure, which the Holy Ghost distributeth every one, euen as he will, & according to euery mans proper disposition, & cooperation &c. And against *Stapleton*, let mee oppose *Osius*, alledged by *Chemnissius*, to wit, *Synodum Tridentinam maluisse appellare preparationes, vel dispositiones ad gratiam, quam meritum congrui*: that the *Trent* Councell chose rather to name preparations and dispositions to grace, then Merit of Congruity. Where vpon *Chemnissius* addeth: and, sayth hee, "let the reader diligently note this, that the Councell of *Trent* by the word Preparation, and Disposition, doth vnderstand the same thing, which the Schoolemen doe: "whē they dispute of the merit of congruity. For in those "very dispositions of the Schoolemen about merit of "congruity, every where do the words Preparation and "disposition resound; as there hee sets downe sundry instances. In a word I oppose *Bellarmino* to *Stapleton*, who going about to elude the Scripture about justification freely by grace, vrged by Protestants, sayth, *Respondeo, Particula illa gratis duobus modis accipi potest: uno modo, &c.* I answer (saith he) the particle *Gratis*, or Freely

Rom. 3.  
Bellar. de iust.  
ib. 1. cap. 21.



Freely, may be taken two wayes: the one is, as it may bee opposed to debt of Iustice, or merites of congruity, as Divines speake, which are absolutely and simply merits. And thus, free Iustification doth not exclude works, which may be said to concur to Iustification, as Dispositions, or as merites of congruity, provided wee doe not attribute to them merite of condignity, whereof the Councel of Trent speaketh in the sixt Session, chap. 8. where it sayth. A man is justified freely, because neither faith nor works, which goe before Iustification, doe merite it. *Et iuxta hunc modum*, &c. And according heereunto it is not one and the same; for a man to be iustified freely, and to be iustified by faith alone. For to be iustified freely, is to be iustified without the merit of condignity. To bee iustified by faith alone, is to have nothing required to iustification, but faith, which how false it is, wee have already shewed. So *Bellarmino*. Where note two principall particulars: 1 that by Dispositions vnto Iustification he vnderstands Merits of Congruity, he accounts them convertible termes; So that the Councell of Trent speaking of Dispositions and Preparations to Iustification, intends thereby nothing els, but Merites of Congruity. 2 that this Councell of Trent, saying, *A man is iustified freely*, vnderstands it in regard of merit of Congruity: it excludes *merits of condignity* as going before Iustification, but not *merits of Congruity*. Thus we see the vanity of M. *Cholmleyes* third reason, and the swelling emptinesse of his vnderstanding in the mysteries of Trent.

Come we to his 4<sup>th</sup> reason.

‘Fourthly, I say, that there is as much fresh water in *Romes* M. Ch. p. 8.  
‘doctrines since the Councel of Trent, as there was before:  
‘*Ergo* it is not here to be vnderstood: This I proue by the  
‘doctrin of the Tridentin Catechisme; in euery part where-  
‘of there is sufficient quantity of sauing doctrin for those,  
‘that (to vse your own words) can search & find it out, se-  
‘parating the good frō the bad, & truth frō errour: as may  
‘appeare to them that will take the paines to read it: yea, I  
‘dare be bold to say, the Church of Rome had not for many

' hundred yeares before the Councell of Trent, so good a  
 ' forme of doctrine, as that Catechisme containeth: which  
 ' I speake not to justify the Councell, or the Catechisme  
 ' in any error comprehended therein, but onely to shew  
 ' the beggery of the adversary: of which this shall bee suf-  
 ' ficient.

*Reply.*

How? As much fresh waters in Romes doctrines since  
 the Councell of Trent, as before? What say you then (M<sup>r</sup>  
*Cholinley*) to the Tridentine *Index expurgatorius*, whose  
 office it is, like a great Limbeck, to extract and draw away  
 out of their riuers (I meane their Authours before the  
 Councell of Trent) whatsoever fresh waters of fundamen-  
 tall and saving truth were found in them. For the purpose,  
 whatsoever is found in Catholicke authors (as they call  
 them) directly or expressly repugnant to the Trent-Ca-  
 nons and Decrees, as touching *Iustification*, *Merit*, *Invoca-*  
*tion*, *Adoration*, or any other Popish trumpery, it must bee  
 purged away in this Expurgatory Index. See their Indices  
 printed at *Madrid* 1584, and reprinted one at *Strasburg*  
 1609, in 8: another at *Salmuri* in 4<sup>o</sup> 1601. Where the rea-  
 der may finde these and the like sentences to bee spunged  
 out, as out of *Antonius Abbas* his Sermons, *Eam vero so-*  
*lummodo naturam, quae increata est, colere, ac venerari debe-*  
*mus*: That nature only, which is vncreated, wee ought to  
 adore and worship. Out of *Ferus* on *Math. 12. Christus hic*  
*aperte pronunciat nos ex natura nostra malos arbores esse*:  
 Christ here openly pronounceth, that wee by our nature  
 are euill trees. Out of *Chrysostome*, *de verbis Pauli*, Not on-  
 ly this, but wee glory in afflictions, tom. 3. p. 945. *Nihil onero-*  
*sis, aut laboriosis, aut molestis mandatis impositis, sed fide tan-*  
*um requisita, & iustificavit nos, & sanctos reddidit, &c*: By  
 no burthen some, or toyle some, or troublesome commande-  
 ments injoynd, but by faith only required, God hath both  
 justified and sanctified vs. And in *Psal. 95. Si quid dicitur*  
*absq<sup>ue</sup>*



*absq. Scriptura, auditorū cogitatio claudicat, nūc annuens, nūc  
 hesitans, &c.* If any thing be spoken without Scripture, the  
 minde of the hearers halteth, now assenting, now doubting,  
 &c. Out of a book intituled *Ordo baptizandi, cum modo visi-  
 tandi*: printed at Venice 1576: *Credis non propriis meritis, sed  
 passionis Domini nostri Iesu Christi virtute ac merito ad glo-  
 riam pervenire? &c.* Dost thou belecue to come to glory not  
 by thine owne merits, but by the vertue and merite of the  
 Passion of our Lord Iesus Christ? Yea this *Index Expur-  
 gatorius*, to show what a good-will it hath to be fingering  
 the sacred Scripture it selfe hath not spared sentences of  
 Scripture, set downe by Authors in their workes. As in the  
*Index* of Robert Stephens vpon the bookes of the Olde and  
 New Testament, many such like sentences, as these, must  
 out: as, *Omnis, qui vivit, & credit in me, non morietur in ater-  
 num*: Euery one that liueth, & belecueth in me, shal not dye Ioh. 11. 26  
 for euer. *Nihil discrevit inter nos et illos, fide purificans cor-  
 da eorum*: He put no difference betweene vs and them, pu- Act. 15. 9.  
 rifying our hearts by faith. *Scientes autem, &c.* Knowing  
 that a man is not justified by the workes of the Law, but Gal. 2. 16.  
 by the faith of Iesus Christ; and we haue beleueed in Iesus  
 Christ, that we may be justified by the faith of Christ, and  
 not by the deeds of the Law. And that 1 Cor. 1. 30. And of  
 him are yee in Christ Iesus, who of God is made vnto vs  
 wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and re-  
 demption. And that *Psal. 143. or 142. 2.* Enter not into  
 judgement with thy seruant, for in thy sight shall no man  
 liuing be justified. All these, and infinite catalogues more  
 of diuine truths, are by the Tridentine *Index* to bee purged  
 out of all such Authors, as we haue mentioned, which were  
 before the Councell of Trent, besides all Protestant bookes  
 whatsoeuer, which as totally hereticall, are catalogued for  
 prohibited bookes. So that wee must know that now since  
 the Councell of Trent, no Pontifician Writer must publish  
 any thing containing any such doctrines of saving truth, as  
 we see cancelled by the *Index*. Yea in their vulgar Cate-  
 chismes



chilines they haue left out the second Commaundement, which forbiddeth Image-worship. All this and much more well considered, how proues your saying true, *M Cholmley*, that there is as much fresh water in Romes doctrines since the Conncell of Trent, as before?

But you proue it by the Doctrine of the Tridentine Catechisme, in euery part whereof is sufficient quantity of sauing doctrine. Where can you show any one point of sauing doctrine in any one part of that Catechisme? For pag. 7. for the rule of faith it teacheth Traditions, as a part of the word of God, and so a part, as both by the Priests pressing, & the peoples practise, the Scripture is shouldered out, & mustled vp. Pag. 9. Their faith is no other but an assent to diuine things deliuered; and this faith must depend vpon the authority and approbation of the Church. Pag. 49. it teacheth there is a Purgatory fire, wherein the soules of the godly after death is life being for a certaine time tormented, are expiated or purged, that so an entrance into the eternall countrey may be opened vnto them, into which entreteth no vncleane thing. *Ac de huius, &c.* And of the truth of this doctrine, which sacred Councils declare to be confirmed both by testimonies of Scripture, & by Apostolick Tradition, the Parish Priest shall diligently and frequently intreat, because we are fallen into those times wherein men cannot endure wholesome doctrine. This belike is one of those sauing and wholesome doctrines, mentioned or meant by *M Cholmley*. Pag. 50. this Catechisme teacheth, that Christ descended into hell to free just and holy men from that miserable Prison, Pag. 257. Duplex, &c. The power Ecclesiasticall is twofold: of order, and of iurisdiction. The power of order hath reference to the true body of our Lord Christ in the sacred Eucharist, &c. And pag. 259. Order is truly & properly to be called a Sacrament: wherefore the B<sup>p</sup> reaching the chalice with wine & water, & the Paten with bread, to him that is ordained Priest, saith, Take thou a power to offer sacrifice, &c. And pag. 266. Accipe potestatem, &c. Take thou a power to offer sacrifice to God, & to celebrate Masses as well for

for the living, as for the dead: by which ceremonies & words is  
instituted the Interpreter & Mediator of God & men, which is  
to be esteemed the principall function of the Priest. Ad extremū  
verō &c. And in the last place, the power of binding & loosing  
is giuent to him. Pag. 394. Secundo loco, In the second place, we  
fly to the help of Saints in Heauen. Pag. 395. Illud etiam, &c.  
This also in the explication of this Cōmandement (to wit, the  
first cōmandement, Thou shalt haue no other Gods but me)  
is diligently to be taught, that the veneration and invocation of  
Saints and blessed soules, which inioy celestiaall glory, or els the  
worship which the Catholicke Church hath euer used towards  
their bodies, and their holy ashes is not repugnant to this Law;  
and so along concerning image-worship to the 301 page,  
where the Parish Priest is cōmanded to follow the Decrees  
of the Tridentine Councell, & to expound the same where  
need is to his people. Many more instances of the same stuff  
frō the Romane Catechisme might be gathered. But these  
may suffice for a prooffe. Now all this while, & all along, I  
cannot finde those sauing doctrines, whereof M Cholmley  
speaketh, vnlesse these be they. Els, I leaue him to find them  
out; & because his iudgment is aboue the capacity of an or-  
dinary reader, he shall doe well, first to separate the good frō  
the bad, and truth from errour, before he send the Readers to  
that catechisme, lest in that golden cup, so double gilded  
with his cōmendations, they may drink the deadly poison,  
in stead of sauing doctrine. Before he send a man through  
such a rocky sea, he had need first to marke out all the dan-  
gerous hidden rocks & shelues, for feare of shipwrack. But  
M Cholm. acknowledgeth he cōmends not the catechisme  
or Cōūcel, to iustify any error cōprehended therein. I hope  
you doe not M Cholm. What then? What hath transported  
you thus to magnifie the Trent-Councell & Catechisme?  
Surely only to shew the beggery of the adversary. Alas that  
beggery can find no better fauor in the eies of your charity  
thē thus disgracefully & importunately to presse it vpō your  
poore brother. How often haue you had it vp? you haue



by this time reproached me these ten times, and are not ashamed. Beggerie you haue worne threed bare, like a beggers weede. But if you haue thus compelled mee like the sturdie begger to wrest from you by cleane strength of demonstration, a concession of the cause, about which you quarrelled me: blame your selfe, and not me.

But what's next?

M. Cholin.  
pag. 9.

The second thing hee chargeth mee withall, is disorder. *His disorder shewes it selfe in 3 things: 1 in not setting the state of the question: Secondly, in misplacing his owne arguments. Thirdly, in idle repetitions.*

*Reply.*

Thus in order *Disorder* followes beggerie. But for the first point of Disorder, the Reader will excuse mee, sith I handled the point but in *transitu*, & *obiter*, by the way, not otherwise. Againe, I tooke it for granted, and to bee *extra aleam controversie*, that all men knew well enough what was meant by the Church of *Rome*, without any more adoe. For the second, may not a man place his owne arguments, as him pleaseth? If M. Cholinley can picke out his owne advantage from my misplacing, hee may rather thanke me, then quarrell me. But the mischief is, he quarrelleth my misplacing of my arguments, as done *artificially* (saith he) *for his best advantage*. Pardon me this fault M. Cholinley. *For the third, Idle repetitions*; and a little lower, *much babbling*: when you show wherein, it will bee soone enough to frame an answer. But in all yours I cannot finde one single sound confutation.

But the maine thing is, not stating the question. I say, I tooke it as granted of all, that all professing themselves Papists, and to adhere to the Pope as their Head, both Cleargy and Laity make vp this Church of *Rome*, as M. Cholinley himselfe layes it down, pag. 10. saying, sometimes (& most usually) it comprehendeth all the national Churches which communicate with *Rome* in the same faith, and vnder the  
same



(17)  
same Head, the Pope, commonly called the Catholicke  
Roman Church. But whereas he sayth pag. 11, sometimes  
the Papacy or Apostacy in that Church, which is *S. Johns  
Babylon*, is taken for the Church of Rome: this is no di-  
stinct acception of the Church of Rome from the former,  
as now the Church of Rome standeth, as wee shall shew a-  
none; the Church of Rome being now a generall visible  
Apostacy, the question in hand. For his other divisions I  
passe over, as not materiall to the question. But whereas  
pag. 13: he makes soundnes (which I suppose he meaneth of  
doctrin) to be the accidental to a true Church: he must giue  
me leaue to deny this: for soundnes of doctrine (if that bee  
his meaning) is not accidentall, but essentiall to constitute  
a true Church of God. Also his third branch of a Church  
visible in regard of the true markes of it, is very defectiue,  
and comes short of the purpose, while hee sets not downe  
expressly which bee those markes of a true Church. So as  
his owne stating of the question is defectiue in the maine  
point, to wit, in setting downe the true markes of a true, or  
visible true Church. For the maine question controverted,  
is, not, whether there bee a secret number of Gods Elect  
within the verge of the Church of Rome, as yet vncalled,  
vnculled out, which *M. Cholinley* makes one of his mem-  
bers of the acception of the Church of Rome: nor, whe-  
ther God haue a hidden people, or Church, which is the  
Romane Church, and yet communicateth not with her ab-  
ominations, which some call the Church in the wilderness,  
and which *M. Cholinley* makes another member of the ac-  
ception of the Church of Rome: but the maine question (I  
say) is, whether the Church of Rome, consisting of the  
Pope the Head, and of all Papists his members, openly a-  
vowing and avouching the same, bee a visible Church of  
Christ. In the vpshot *M. Cholinley* states the question thus:  
*Although diuerse men doe set the state of the question diuersly,  
as may best serue for their owne private ends and purposes: yet  
I will take it in the largest extena, and as it may bee most*  
fa-

*faunourable for the Church of Rome.* But M. Cholmley should  
 so state the question, as may be, not *most faunourable for the*  
*Church of Rome* (for so it may be suspected, as best seruing  
 for his *owne priuate ends and purposes* (which he blameth in  
 others) but most agreeable to the truth of the cause in hand.  
 But he states it thus: Whether the Catholicke Church  
 of Rome (as it is called in opposition to the Diocese) in  
 regard of the whole body thereof compounded of Clear-  
 gy and Laity, be still within the Covenant of Gods sauing  
 grace: and haue such markes of that covenant still abiding  
 in it, that though properly at once and altogether it cannot  
 be visible, yet by peece-meale, and successiuee, surely it may  
 truly be said so to be. And so much for the state of the  
 question. So he.

Now for this manner of stating the question, wee haue  
 just cause to except against it: 1 in regard of some termes  
 superfluous and improper. 2 for some things obscure: and  
 3 for the maine Defects of it. 1 That he calls the Church of  
 Rome Catholick, the Church of Rome hath cause to thank  
 him, & sound Protestants to be offended: That he qualifies  
 it, *As it is called in opposition to the Diocese*: this is impertin-  
 ent to the purpose & question in hand. For the question is  
 not of the Diocese of Rome, but of the whole Church. And  
 the whole Church of Rome is not opposed to, but compre-  
 hendeth the Diocese. Now although Catholick signify pro-  
 perly Vniuersall; yet in the Church of Romes sense, it is  
 taken for the true, Orthodoxe, Catholicke Church, with-  
 out which is no saluation. And doth not M. Cholmley know  
 that in calling themselves Catholickes, they brand vs for  
 Hereticks: For Catholicke & Heretick are euer opposite.  
 Let him take heed therefore he conclude not himselfe an  
 Hereticke, that cōfesseth the Church of Rome Catholicke,  
 For more surety therefore he should haue said (vnder cor-  
 rection) *the whole Church, not, the Catholicke Church of Rome.*  
 2 for his obscurity: as, he expresseth not what he meaneth  
 by being within the covenant of Gods sauing grace. And  
 to speake properly, none are within the Covenant of Gods  
 sauing



saving grace, but only Gods Elect in Christ: but M *Cholmley*  
 cannot shew that the whole Church of Rome cōpounded of  
 Clergy & laity, are Gods elect in Christ; & therefore he cānot  
 say, that the Church of *Rome* is within the couenāt of Gods  
 sauing grace. Neither doth M. *Cholmley* show this through-  
 out his whole booke. Againe he dasheth vpon a sophisme *ā*  
*bene cōiunctis ad male diuisa*, from the whole to a part, from  
 the Vniuersall to a particular, in saying, *That though properly*  
*at once & altogether it cannot be visible, yet by peecemeale, &*  
*successinely it may truly be said so to be.* For it it haue the true  
 marks of Gods couenāt still abiding in it, & those appearing  
 in the publicke Ministration; what should hinder, that such a  
 Church should not properly at once, & altogether, *rebus sic*  
*stātibus*, be visible? yet M. *Chol.* seems to say that the Church  
 may haue the true markes of visibility, & yet not be visible.  
 otherwise for my part, I vnderstād him not. And it is requi-  
 site, to the stating of a question, that it be set downe in most  
 cleare & expresseful termes, void of obscurity or ambiguity.  
 3<sup>d</sup> as his stating of the questiō is improper, obscure, ambigu-  
 us, & sophistical: so it is very defectiue, & comes not home.

To make this appeare, the intire stating, or putting of the  
 questiō ought to be thus: whether the Church of *R.* cōsisting  
 of one visible head the Pope, & of all Papists wheresoeuer &  
 whatsoeuer, Clergy & Laity, professing theselues mēbers of  
 that head; be a true & visible Church of Christ, that is, such as  
 in the intire faith & doctrine therof defined, & decreed in the  
 Coūcell of *Trent*, men liuing & dying, are or may be saued.

Now wheras it may be objected, there are sundry differēt  
 opiniōs in that Church, held by priuate sects, or persōs, disso-  
 nāt frō the general ietled doctrines therof, as about the merit  
 of cōgruity, certainty of saluation, & the like: this hindereth  
 not the generality of the questiō thus stated. For all their pri-  
 uate opiniōs must vaile bonnet, & appeale to the determina-  
 tiō of the Pope, who stiffly maintains the irrefragable *decrees*  
 & *canōs* of *Trent*, which their whole clergy are solēly sworn  
 to keepe inviolable. Nor are any of them permitted without  
 speciall authority frō the Pope to make their interpretatiōs,

*The true state of  
the question.*

*Bulla confir-  
mationis,*

C

or to



to write commentaries vpon the same *Decrees*; and if they shall seeme to any man to be obscure, and to need interpretation, or explanation: *ascendat ad locum &c.* let him go vpon to the place which the Lord hath chosen, namely the sea Apostolicke, the Mistris of all the faithfull &c. For wee (sayth the Pope, the Oracle of the Church of *Rome*) haue  
 “referred to our selues all difficulties, and controuersies,  
 “which might arise from the said *Decrees*, to bee by vs  
 “declared and decided, as also the holy Synod hath decreed;  
 “and if any thing bee wittingly or ignorantly attempted to the contrary, wee decree the same to be void  
 “and of no force. This is the Popes definitiue sentence in the Bull of *Pius 4.* in confirmation of the *Tridentine* Councell: Thus all Papists of what sort or sect soeuer, whatsoever their opinions be, if they swerue from the *Decrees* of *Trent*, which containe the irrefragable canon-rule of Popish faith and religion, they are declared to bee meere void by the Popes owne *Decree*, and the authors themselves fall vnder the curse of both *Pope* and *Councell*: So as whatsoever is predicated or defined of the Church of *Rome* in generall is also predicated of all and euery member and part thereof, all being joyntly combined in one head, the Pope, and all confined to the *Decrees* and *Canons* of *Trent*, and to the Popes brest the Oracle of all, and that vnder *Anathema*. But (as I touched before) if there shall be any in that Church, whom God hath reserved to himselfe, who haue not bowed the knee to Baal, who abhorre the Idolatry and tyranny of Antichrist: yea, say there should be many thousands of such, lurking in corners within the compasse of the Papall Dominions: yet it cannot hereupon bee inferred and concluded, that the Church of *Rome* is a true visible, or visible true Church; because such as are so separated and selected by God, and reserved to himselfe, who truly belieue in Christ according to the Scriptures, are so farre from being members of the Church of *Rome*, as they are by the doome of *Trent* sentenced and accursed  
 for

for heretickes; & cut off quite from that Church, although they yet liue in it.

The state of the question thus laid and cleared, proceed we to the rest which followeth.

My first argumēt (as M. *Cholmley* there sets it down) is. *Pag. 14. 15.*

“That Church which denieth, yea accurseth the sauing faith &c.

“of Iesus Christ vnto justification, allowing onely such a *Vials p. 24.*

“faith, which can neuer saue a man, but is a gracelesse faith,

“separable from grace, and which a man may carry with

“him into hell; that is an apostatized Church, vtterly fal-

“len away from grace, wherein no saluation is to be found

“or hoped for.

“But the Church of *Rome* doth all this: Ergo.

“To which I answer, by denying all: I deny the Pro. *M. Cholm.*

“position, because it is sophistical; the assumption, because

“it is false: and I need not then doubt to deny the conclusi-

“on. The Proposition is sicke of that Sophisme, which the

“Logitians call *secundum plures interrogationes*, or *proposi-*

“*tiones*: that is, when many propositions are joyned toge-

“ther in one, whereof some are true, some false: as here are

“at least three: one, that the Church (so bablyngly descri-

“bed) is an Apostatized Church: another that it is vtterly

“fallen away from Christ: a third, that no saluation is to

“be found or hoped for therein. Of which, the first onely

“is true, & the rest notoriously false and against the Scrip-

“ture. For first &c.

### *Reply.*

Now good reader, let mee but set downe mine owne argument, as it stands *totidem verbis*, *Vials*, pag. 24: and then judge of M. *Cholmleys* dealing in his setting of it downe. It is thus:

*That Church which denyeth the onely meanes of saluation by Christ, is no true Church of Christ, but such as wherein saluation is not to be expected.*

*But the Church of Rome denyeth the onely meanes by*

*Christ, yea accurseth it, to wit, the iustifying and sauing faith of Christ. Therefore the Church of Rome is no true Church of Christ, but such as wherein no saluation is to bee expected.*

Now for M. Cholmeley to heape vp more particulars into my argument, then I haue set downe, & then to charge me with sophisme, and babling: this is, as hee that closely conveyed two or three siluer spoones into his neighbours pocket, & then layd a felony to his charge. How need we maruaile, that a language pleading so for *Babell*, should proue any other then *babling*.

But admit all those things had bin in my propositiō: how is it a sophisme, if they be not only true, but *homogenea*, pertinent to expresse one & the same thing proposed? euery one of those branches marking out the Church of *Rome*, & prouing her in the Assūption, to be no true Church. Therefore to take them, as he layes thē down: first he confesseth that the Church of *Rome* is an apostatized Church. But the rest (saith hee) are notoriously false, & against the Scripture; as to deny, yea to accurse sauing faith, & to allow the contrary, is not a point of totall & finall Apostacy, vnles it be joyned with malice & obstinacy, & bee the sinne against the holy Ghost, to which repentance is viterly denied. Else (saith he) what shall we say of S. Peter, who both denyed & cursed the knowledge of Christ in himselfe? M. Chol. hath here expressed enough to confirme what I say. For first (though anon he peremptorily denyeth it) he seemeth to grant that the apostatized Church of *Rome* doth deny & accurse the sauing faith: only he would excuse this from a totall & finall apostacy as not joyned with malice, & obstinacy, for this he alledged *Peters* exāple. But how impertinently? For first *Peter* did not deny & accurse the sauing faith of Christ: 2<sup>d</sup>, *Peters* deniall of his Master was of frailty, his feare being for the present strongly assaulted, & overcome: 3<sup>d</sup>, *Peter* eftsoons repented himselfe and was restored. But it fa-  
reth farre otherwise with the Church of *Rome*; for her denying and accursing the sauing faith of Christ, is joy-  
ned with an extreame deliberate malice, and maintain-  
ed



ed with an invincible obstinacie, and that ratified by the irrefragable *Decrees & Canons of Trent*, to which their whole Cleargy is bound by solemne oath, and that vnder paine of *Anathema*. So as this denying and accursing of the *sauiing faith* hath beene, & is still maintained euer since the Councel of Trent, & is neuer like to be repealed, vnlesse the Pope call another Councell, to repeale & make voyd that of Trent, which is like to be *ad gracas Calendas*, when the Pope & his followers purpose to turne Protestants. And therefore for M *Cholmeleyes* Secondly, &c. what saluation may be found & hoped for in the Church of *Rome*, in the interim, notwithstanding that denyall & execration of sauiing faith, & approbatiō of the cōtrary: I leaue him in that hope.

pag. 15.

But thirdly (saith he) *is would be remembred, that our question is of the whole body of the Church, that is, neither of the popular part only, nor of the representatiue only, but of both together: if then the one parts only shall doe as he saith, & not the whole body, who can say that there is no Saluation to be found therein, or that it is viterly fallen away from Christ. So much for the proposition.*

M. Cholm-  
ley. pag. 5.

Reply.

*Memini, tametsi nullus moneas.* I remember it well M *Cholmley*. And you must remember too, that herein you vary frō your self in your stating the question, as we have noted before. But where you speake of the whole body of the Church, you must remēber, you meane no other, but the Church of *Rome*. Again, what meane you by your distribution into the popular and representitiue part? Do you meane by the popular, the Church of *Rome* in general, & by the representatiue, the councel of Trent? or by the popular, the laity; & by the representatiue, the Clergy, though very improper? But whatsoeuer you meane, it is to very small purpose. For which, or what one part can you either demonstrate, or make it probable to vs, that they hold otherwise, thē the cōūcel of Trēt hath defined. The clergy? why, they are all sworne to the cōtrary. The lay-people? Alas, which way shall those blindlings goe, but where their guides lead thē? The Scripture is shut vp frō thē, in an vnkown tongue

and by Papall prohibition. What other confession of faith then can be expected frō them, but *to beliene as the Church of Rome beleeneth*? And M. *Cholmley* might remember that *faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. But how shall they heare, without a Preacher? And how shall they preach without they be sent?* And who dare preach otherwise then the *Councell of Trent* hath peremptorily prescribed?

M. *Cholm.*

But he descends to the *Assumption*, or *minor proposition* of my former argument: In the next place, I say, the *assumption* is evidently false, if not more then *slāderous*. For *first* the Church of *Rome* (whether partially, or wholly *vnderstood*,) neuer denied, neuer accused *saving & justifying* faith, nor euer allowed a *gracelesse* faith only, which cannot saue: looke vpon all the *Canons* of the *Council of Trent*, and see whether any such thing bee to bee found therein, or gathered therefrom: Doth it not distinguish *betweene* a *liuing* and a *dead* faith? And doth it not say, *that the liuing faith onely justifieth, and not the dead?* *what is it then, that it denyeth and accurseth?* It is this, *first* the *forme* and *manner* of *justification* by faith: *whē it is said to justifie, as the very forme of justification, and not as a meere disposition thereto.* *Secōdly* this assertion, *that a dead faith, separate from grace, is not a true fayth, though it cannot justifie; this is that, which the Councell denyeth and accurseth in this case and no more: yet you say boldly, if not impudently, pag. 25.* If any dare deny this, he will but bewray his *shamelesse ignorance* in this point. In what point M. *Burton*. That the *Councell of Trent* admitteth of no other faith, than that which the *Deuill* and *dāned in hell* haue? O mouth! O forehead! *Haue they a liuing faith, which is fruitfull in good workes?* Such a faith as *S. Iames* commendeth? and doth not the *Councell* admit of this faith? yea of this onely for *justification*? Read the latter part of the *seauenth chapter* of the *sixt Session*, and be ashamed.

Reply



Pardon mee, good reader, it in a point of such consequence so pertinent to the question in hand, I set downe the authors words at length; and the rather because I heare his bookes proued but a hard bargain to the Printer, or at least to the booke-sellers, finding but few buyers. Now for answer, first I refferre thee to what I haue breiefely sette downe in this point in my *Plea to the Appeale*, pag. 72: and more largely in my booke of *Iustification*, intituled *Truths triumph ouer Trent*: which by Gods speciall prouidence came forth two or three dayes before that of M. *Butterfields*, and this of M. *Cholmeleys*, wherein this maine exception of his, as it were by diuine preuention, is mette withall. Yet I will adde a word or two here for thy present satisfaction, and for the repressing of the Aduersaries importune insolence.

Now let vs see, whether my *Assumpcion*, or M. *Cholmeleys* assertion, is *evidently false*, if not more then *slandrons*: and which of vs hath the *mouth* and *forehead*, *boldly*, if not *impudently*, (to vse his own language) to avouch an vntruth, I against, or hee for, the *Councell of Trent*. The summe of my defence, is to proue that the *Councell of Trent* denyeth and accurseth the *justifying and saving faith* of Christ. To proue and evince this, first take we a definition of justifying faith from our mother *Church of England*: *Justifying faith, is not onely a common beliefe of the Articles of our faith, but also a true trust and confidence of the mercy of God through our Lord Iesus Christ, and a stedfast hope of all good things to bee receiued at Gods hand. And a little lower, It is a sure ground and foundation, a Certificate and sure looking for. It is an assured faith and trust in God. And pag. 23. The very sure & liuely Christian faith, is an earnest trust and confidence in God, that hee doth regard vs for his onely sonnes sake &c.* This faith, in the same homily, our Church distinguisheth in kind from the *historicall faith*, or the faith

Homily of  
faith part. I.  
pag. 22.

of



Catech. Rom.  
cap. 1.

of assent, which is in the Diuels and damned; according to the Scriptures. Now the *Councell of Trent*, doth flatly and expressly deny and accurseth this kind of faith, which our Church hath defined to bee a *Confidence in Gods mercy*. And that three wayes. 1 It denies the kind of this faith. 2 the prime qualities of it: 3 the proper vse of it. First, the *Councell of Trent*, denyeth the very kind of this sauing faith, allowing of none other kind of faith, but the historicall, which is a general assent to the truth reuealed: Sess. 6. c. 6. This is that only faith which they teach, as in the *Romā Catechisme*, set forth by the decree of the Pope & Cōcell of *Trent*, where their onely faith is thus defined: *Fides est cuius vi omnino assentimur ijs que tradita sunt diuinitus*: Faith is that by vertue whereof wee assent to those things, which are deliuered by God. And a little lower, to show wherevpon this their faith is grounded; it is added: *Fides est, cuius virtus efficit, ut id ratum habeamus, quod a Deo traditum esse sanctissima matris Ecclesie autoritas comprobabit*: Faith causeth, that we hold those things for true which the authority of our most holy mother the Churen hath approued to be deliuered of God.

Note here then in the first place, how that kind of faith, which the Church of *Rome* onely teacheth and avoweth, building it also vpon humane authority, & not primarily, & solely vpon the diuine Scriptures, and vpon the authority of God speaking therein, condemnes our Church for the dead faith, common to the Diuels and damned. So that hence it is plaine, that the faith of the Church of *Rome* is meerely humane, as built vpon mans authority, and not vpon Gods, vpon the Church of *Rome*, and not vpon the Scriptures; so as neither the Scripture, nor any one Article of the Creed is believed of them, but so farre as the authority of the Church of *Rome* giueth them approbation. And thus the Church of *Rome* doth not belecue simply any one Article of the Creed, but ouerturneth all.

Ob. But, sayth M. Cholmley, Dost not the *Councell of Trent*

*Trent distinguish betweene a living and a dead faith.*

Concil. Trid.  
Sess. 6, Can. 118.

*Ans.* Howsoever they distinguish in words, yet in deed it is but one kinde of faith, which they holde; and they call it *dead* before hope and charity be together, with it infused, and then it is *living*, say they: but after grace, to wit, hope and charity is lost, it is dead, as it was before. And againe, they say, that when *grace* is lost, yet *faith* is not alwayes lost; and that *faith* which remaineth, though it bee dead, yet is the *true faith*. Where you see how they plainly distinguish and diuide betweene faith and grace: for grace, to wit, hope and charity, may bee lost (say they) yet faith remaines. Whereas the true kinde of justifying faith is no lesse a gift of grace, then hope and charity is. And though they call their faith a living faith, when hope and charity doe accompanie it; yet of it selfe, and its owne nature it is not living; but hope and charitie are those living graces, for whose sake they call it a living faith. So that, for their faith to be living, is not of the nature or essence of it, nor is living the essentiall qualitie or propertie of their faith, but is made to depend vpon other causes, external-ly, not naturallie inherent. So as their living faith is a meere figment. For how can one habite bee the forme of another? But hope and charity are distinct habites: and therefore are not the forme or life of faith. Yet this is that onely faith of Rome, which Bellarmine calls Catholicke, or Dogmaticall. Onely hee faith *Catholici &c.*

*See* *kes use not to call it historicall faith, lest they might*  
*me to imagine (as indeede they doe not imagine) that the*  
*Acts of the Saints, which are related in Scripture, are not*  
*beleened, but for the authority of the penman of the Hi-*  
*story. A pretty evasion. Nay the Pontificians are ashamed*  
*to name that faith, which alone they only avow & professe,*  
*namely the Historicall, which they guild over with Catho-*  
*lick forsooth, & Dogmaticall. As though Historicall were so*  
*called, as it respected the Acts of the Saints recorded in*

Bellar. de Iustif.  
lib. 1. c. 4.



(20)  
the Scriptures, and not the whole *history* of the Scriptures; or as if it could not be *Historicall*, vnlesse it were ground-  
vpon the Authority of the Penmen themselues, and not of  
God himselfe the Author and Inspirer. So that M. Cholm-  
ley must know, if he will not bee a novice in the mysteries  
of Trent, that their distinguishing betweene a *dead* and *li-  
ving faith*, is but a meere mocking, and trick of legierde-  
maine.

Secondly, as the *Councell of Trent* denyeth the kinde of  
*Iustifying faith*. So it accurseth the prime qualities & pro-  
perties of it, as *Confidence* and *Affiance in Gods mercy*, as our  
*Church* hath defined. The Councels Canon is, *Si quis dixe-  
rit Fidem iustificantem nihil aliud esse quam fiduciam divine  
misericordiae peccata remittentis propter Christum: vel eam  
fiduciam solam esse qua iustificamur, Anathema sit*. If any  
man shall say, that justifying faith is nothing els, but a  
confidence or trust in Gods mercy, forgiuing sinnes for  
Christ, or that confidence to be that only, whereby we are  
justified, let him be accursed. See for this also, chap. 9. of  
the same Session: where they vie egregious hypocrisie  
in excluding confidence ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> faith, as if it could not be with-  
out boasting; so as the *confidence* of ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> *Church of England* is  
found with *vaine boasting*. Thus the *Church* of *England* is  
accursedly the Councell of Trent, for holding  
a confidence and sure trust in Gods mercy.

Can. 13. *ibid.*

To this they adde also another Canon discharged  
gainst *Certainty of saving faith*, as Can. 13. *Si quis dixe-  
rit omni homini ad remissionem peccatorum assequendam, ne-  
cessarium esse, ut credat certo & absq. ulla hesitatione pro-  
pria infirmitatis & indispositionis, peccata sibi esse remissa:  
anathema sit*. That is, If any man shall say, that for the ob-  
taining remission of sinnes it is necessary for euery man  
to beleue certainly, and without any doubting of his  
owne infirmity and disposition, that his sinnes are for-  
giuen: let him bee accursed. I haue put downe the  
Councels words intirely, and at length, lest M. Cholmley

out of his tender indulgence to preserve the Councils credit, might quarrell me for wronging the Council, as hee elsewhere unjustly doth.

Now although the wordes of the Council be expresse enough, to shew they deny and accurse the onely *sauiing* faith: yet take *Bellarmines* Commentarie with it. Hee sayth, *Fidem iustificantem non esse fiduciam misericordiae, sed solum assensum, firmum, ac certum, ad ea omnia, quae Deus credenda proponit*: Iustifying faith is not a confidence in GODS mercy, but onely a firme and certaine assent to all those things, which GOD proposeth to bee beleueed. And neere the end of the Chapter: *Fidem iustificare, quatenus per eam credimus ea, quae gignunt timorem, ac per hoc quatenus non est fiducia misericordiae*: Faith iustifyeth, as by it wee beleue those things which breed feare, and therefore not as it is a confidence of GODS mercy. But of this sufficient. See my booke of Iustification.

In the third place, the Council of Trust denyeth and accurseth the proper use and worke of sauiing faith in Iustification, which is to apply and appropriate the merites and righteousnesse of CHRIST to the soule and person of the beleuer, whereby hee is iustified in GODS sight. This is in part confessed by M *Cholmley*, onely hee speaketh somewhat perplexedly, and indeede improperly and vnsoundly, in saying, *that faith iustificieth as the forme of iustification*: whereas faith iustificieth onely instrumentally, not formally. They deny also iustifying faith to bee a particular faith, and affiance, but that it is onely a generall assent. But the maine thing wherein he most iustificieth the Council of Trent in this place is, that shee alloweth no other iustifying faith, but that which hath hope and loue ioyned with it, which we haue already refelled; nor this faith iustifying otherwise, but as Hope and Charity, inherent graces: the onely formall iustification in the Church of Rome.



Only heere one thing I will adde to shew the vanitie of that assertion; and it is well worthie our obseruation: to wit, that though the Councell of Trent allow to their faith no place in iustification, but as it comes accompanied with hope and charity, their inherent righteousnesse: yet they so seeme to ascribe iustification to faith vnformed (as they call it) or before it come to bee ioyned with hope and charity, as by this meanes they quite ouerthrow and elude all those pregnant places of Scripture, which appropriate iustification to faith alone. Marke the Councels wordes in the eight Chapter of the Sixt Session: *Cum verò Apostolus dicit iustificari hominem per fidem gratis, ea verba in eo sensu intelligenda sunt, quem perpetuus Ecclesia Catholica consensus tenuit & expressit: ut scilicet per fidem, ideo iustificari dicamur, quia fides est humane salutis initium, fundamentum, & radix omnis iustificationis, sine qua impossibile est placere DEO, & ad filiorum eius consortium pervenire, &c.* That is: And whereas the Apostle layth, A man is iustified by faith, and freely; these words are to bee vnderstood in that sense, which the perpetuall consent of the Catholicke Church hath held and declared: to wit, that wee are saide to bee iustified by faith, because faith is the beginning of mans salvation, the foundation, and roote of all iustification, without which it is impossible to please GOD, and to come to the fellowship of his Sonne. To make this more cleare, let vs take *Andreas Vega* his Commentary, who himselfe was a great man in the Councell: who quarrelling those Diuines which helde iustifying faith so much commended in scripture to bee onely the *living faith*, which in kinde is distinct from the *dead faith*: hee sayth thus: *Sed contra eos omnes quantalibet sint autoritate, probatur nostra propositio. Primo, Et Paulus, & ceteri Apostoli, imò & ipse CHRISTVS, cum fidei tribuebant nostram salutem, & iustificationem, cum & eam exigebant ab eis,*

qms

quibus predicabant, agebant de fide, per quam acquirere possumus, & vere acquirimus iustitiam, docebantq; nos Dispositionem, qua nos ex parte nostra disponimur ad gratiam. Sed ista fides non est fides formata, aut saltem non in quantum formata habet ista efficere. *Præcedit enim saltem natura ipsam charitatem, qua formatur, sicut dispositio antecedit formam ad quam disponit.* That is: But against them all, of what authority soever they bee, our Proposition is proved. First, both *Paul*, and the other Apostles, yea and *CHRIST* himselfe when they attributed our salvation and iustification to faith, when also they required it of those to whom they did preach, they spake of faith, by which wee may acquire, and doe truely acquire righteousness, and they taught vs that Disposition, whereby wee for our part dispose our selues to grace. But that faith is not the faith that is formed, or at least, not as it is formed doth it worke these things. For it goeth before (at least in order of nature) charity it selfe, whereby it is formed, as the Disposition goes before the forme to which it disposeth.

To this purpose the learned *Chemnitius* hath well detected the Councils fraud herein (as indeede like the ratter it bewrayes it selfe with its owne voyce) *Quod scilicet ratione Præparationis fides intelligenda sit iustificare:* That is, in regard of Preparation our faith is to bee vnderstood to iustifie. And heereupon hee all adgeth *Can. 12. & cap. 8. & cap. 6.* And withall *Andradine* his exposition of the Councell. *Dicitur, Iustificandi vim fidei in sacris literis ideotribui, quia animum ad accipiendam iustitiam præparet, præmuniat, et præfulciat:* For hee sayth, That, therefore is the Force of Iustification attributed to faith in the Scriptures, because it prepares, fitts, and makes way for the soule to receiue righteousness. *Et illud mox, &c.* And thus (sayth *Chemnitius*) hee by and by expiicates more clearly

Exam. Trid.  
Concil. de fide  
Iustif.



in these words: *Impius fide justificari dicitur, quia fides initium & fundamentum est iustificationis hac ratione, quia fores quodammodo aperit ad spem & charitatem, qua opera sunt ad comparandam & consequendam iustitiam necessaria:* A sinner is sayd to bee justified by faith, because faith is the beginning and foundation of justification in this regard, because it doth after a sort open the doores to hope and charity, which workes are necessary to the procuring and obtaining of righteousness. So *Andradus*. By this time I hope *M. Cholmley* begins to see his owne error, and grosse mistaking of the Councell of *Trent*, and repents him of the unjust reproches wherewith hee hath so loaden his brother, and will acknowledge my argument to stand firme and vnanswerable, vnlesse hee will deny the conclusion.

For his, Secondly, pag. 17. &c. this is but a repetition of that hee said before, pag. 15. 16. which wee haue fully answered; and I am loth *his in eundem lapidem impingere*, as the Prouerbe is, to fall vnder his checke any more for repetitions. Yet least hee should haue the least starting hole left him, and because some new thing is inserted withall, wee will repeate his wordes, and the reply to them.

‘ Secondly. (sayth hee) say the Councell had done so indeede: doth the whole Church of Rome do it? doth the popular part thereof do it? By your owne words, pag. 25. they deny it, yea but they beleeeue as the Church beleeeues. True, but with a secret condition, if the Church beleeeue well, and in that onely, wherein it beleeueth aright: being deceiued in nothing, but that they trust the Church too much; for if they could bee perswaded thee beleeueth amisse in any thing, therein they would not beleeeue as she doth &c.

I hope (as I sayd) *M. Cholmeley*, you your selfe will say, the Councell hath done so indeed, to wit, denyed and accused the sauing and justifying faith. But doth the whole Church

*Church of Rome do it?* The whole Clergy doth it. *But doth the popular part do it? why not? what should lette them to bee as blinde and bad as, their guides?* By your owne words (say you) pag. 25. they deny it. M. *Cholmley*, by this time I cease to wonder at your vnlimited liberty, to speake what you list. It is all one with you to auouch vntrueths, for the Councell of Trent, and against your Christian brother. Every reader of my booke will tell you soe. *Yea but they beleene as the Church beleenes. True, but with a secret condition, if the Church beleene well.* O M<sup>r</sup> *Cholmley*, I cannot but pittie you to see you so farre spent, and driuen to such poore shifts. I am sorry you ihow your selfe so ridiculous to every common reader. Suppose the poore blind people in their beliefe hath such a secret condition. What then? But doth not that Church lay her heauy curse vpon all those, that shall beleene otherwise, then shee hath in her Councell of Trent decreed? But you confesse at length, that the people are *deceued in nothing but that they trust in the Church too much*, and so are perswaded shee beleeueth amisse in nothing. What hope then is left for that poore seduced people? And if any of that blind people come to beleue otherwise then that Church teacheth them, to wit, sauingly, whence haue they that beleefe, M *Cholmley*? From the Church of Rome? Or by extraordinary revelation? Surely not by the ordinary meanes allowed in that Church. And this comes home to my stating of the question, as before. But we proceede.

‘ But you will proue that Romes iustifying faith is dif- M. *Cholmley*  
 ‘ ferent in kind from the true sauing faith of Christ. How? p. 18.

‘ Can you tell? Mary thus.

‘ That faith which Christ commendeth for the only true  
 ‘ sauing faith, doth so iustify a man, that he shall neuer come  
 ‘ into condemnation, but passe from death vnto life.

But



‘ But the only faith which the Church of Rome alloweth, doth not so. *Ergo*

‘ I answer; A Papist or Arminian would deny the Proposition: but I grant it, and deny the Assumption: for ‘ let the Church of Rome confesse what she wil in her own ‘ wrong: I say, that faith which the Church of Rome only ‘ alloweth for Iustification. (viz: a liuing faith, fruitfull in ‘ good workes) doth so saue & iustifie a man, that he cannot ‘ goe with it into condemnation: and dare you say the contrary?

*Reply.*

Yes, I dare, I haue sayd, and sufficiently proued the contrary, which M. Chalmley (I suppose) from henceforth will not dare not deny, what Papists or Armenians would doe, I know well; they would do more, then (God bee thanked) they canne. but I am glad you quit your selfe so fairely from being a Papist or Arminian, in granting the Proposition. But you deny the Assumption. But wee haue already proued it, and so, as it is put past your denyall: yet you seeme to confesse, that the Church of Rome hath confessed to her owne wrong, namely, that with her justifying faith she may goe to hell. So shee hath indeed confessed, whether to her owne wrong, or no, that I leaue to you, her justifier, and Advocate: but I am sure to her owne iust condemnation. But you say that Romes faith, which shee alloweth to iustification doth so saue and iustifie a man, that hee cannot goe with it into condemnation. How dare a Minister of the Church of England, say this, when Rome expressly sayth the contrary? see Councell. Trid. Sess. 6. cap. 15. Not onely infidels, but the faithfull, as fornicators, adulterers, are excluded from the kingdome of beauen. Those which Rome calls faithfull, hauing still faith, yet perish with it. But you say, that Romes iustifying faith doth so saue & iustifie a man, that he cannot goe with it into condemnation. How? For their iustifying faith (say you) is a liuing faith, fruitfull in good workes. But wee haue already proued, and you in part confessed, that the Church of Rome holds not her

Concil. Trid.  
Ses. 6. c. 15.

her selfe justified by this faith, but rather by hope and charity, as they are graces inherent. And doe you hold, with the Councell of Trent, that wee are justified before God by grace inherent? If yee doe not, you must confesse, that their faith doth not at all justifie them, but as a preparatiue or dispositiue to justification, as they hold. But if you doe hold, that a man is justified, so as the Church of Rome holdeth, how can you excuse your selfe from being a ranke papist, a rotten hereticke, (if you persist) and an apostatate Minister of the Church of England? yet this you are not affraid, not ashamed to affirme.

But proceede we:

The second Argument is this:

'That Church which cleaueth to Antichrist as her Head, whence shee receiveth all her spirituall life, is no true Church, nor hath any salvation to be found or hoped for in her:

'But the Church of Rome doth so: *Ergo.*

*M. Cholm-*

'I deny the Assumption; not for that I deny the Pope to bee Antichrist, or for that I would support the Church of Rome in any of her abominations: but first, because the Church of Rome doth not acknowledge the Pope to bee Antichrist, and so cleaueth not to him as Head in that name: Secondly, because, although some Popes haue Antichristianly saide, that all spirituall grace and life is derived from the Pope, and that some of their Parasites haue flatteringly acknowledged it, yet neither the representatiue Church of Rome by it selfe, nor the popular by it selfe, much lesse the whole and intire body, did ever yeeld vnto it, but haue from time to time opposed themselves against it, especially, of the question be of an absolute, Sovereigne, & supreme Head, & not of a subordinate and Ministeriall Head, as you propound it. Thirdly, because in these spirituall thinges there is such a conjunction of good & euill in this life,

E

that

*ley. pag. 19.*



'that though the one cannot be separated from the other,  
 'yet the one is not confounded with the other; so as each  
 'of them receiues its life ſeuerally from its owne head, &  
 'not from the head of the other: As it is in the regenerate  
 'man, in whom the faith and the ſpirit are alwayes com-  
 'panions in this life; yet ſo, as the fleſh receiueth nothing  
 'from the Holy Ghoſt, nor the ſpirit from *Adams* tranſ-  
 'greſſion. And ſo it is in the caſe wee haue in hand. For in  
 'the Church of Rome, there is an inſeparable conjunction  
 'of Babylon and the people of God, yet ſo as Babylon re-  
 'ceiues no grace from Chriſt, nor the people of God Apo-  
 'ſtacie from the Pope, for being members of both in di-  
 'uerſe reſpects, they haue grace from the one, and Apoſta-  
 'cie from the other, which in them are indeed nothing,  
 'but fleſh and ſpirit: And ſo much for his ſecond Argu-  
 ment.

*Reply.*

You deny the Aſſumption, but withall excuſe your ſelfe,  
 as not denying the Pope to be Antichriſt, or that ye would  
 ſupport the Church of Rome in any of her abominations.  
 But you haue done too much already; but belike it is a-  
 gainſt your will: I will in charity belieue it, when you  
 publickly recant it. But firſt you ſay, *the Church of Rome*  
*doth not acknowledge the Pope to bee Antichriſt;* And hath  
 ſhee not reaſon? *nor cleaueth to him as her head:* In that  
 name true; but ſhee cleaueth to him as her head: and you  
 deny him not to be *Antichriſt*: therefore ſhee cleaueth to  
 Antichriſt as her head. The Argument runnes thus:

The Pope is Antichriſt,

The Pope is Head of the Church of Rome:

*Ergo*, Antichriſt is Head of the Church of Rome.

But is this a good reaſon, to ſay, *The Church of Rome*  
*doth not acknowledge the Pope to bee Antichriſt: therefore*  
*ſhee doth not cleaue to him as her head in that name; you*  
*might as well argue thus: The Church of Rome doth not ac-*  
 knowledge

*knowledge the Images to bee Idols: therefore shee doth not in worshipping Images, worship Idols. Or thus, The Church of Rome doth not acknowledge the body of Christ, which they say is really, or rather carnally present in their Host, to be an Idol: ergo, shee doth not worship an Idol.* But suffice it, that the Church of Rome acknowledgeth the Pope in all those titles by him assumed, whereby the Scriptures manifest him to bee that Antichrist: So that in the thing, though not in the name, Antichrist is acknowledged to bee the Head. Hee exalts himselfe aboue all that is called God, he sits in, or ouer, or for the Temple of God, exercising diuine and plenary vnlimited authority ouer all (the note and nature of Antichrist;) the Church of Rome wholly acknowledgeth the Pope the Head, as rightly invested in those titles and Sovereignty: *Ergo*, in effect they acknowledge him to bee Antichrist, as in name their Head.

Secondly it is not only assumed by Popes themselves, nor onely ascribed to them by their Parasites, but it also stands decreed & ratified in their Decretals, that the Pope is one and the same Head with Christ, and from the Pope all spiritual life doth flow, as frō the Head into all the members: & these Decretals are imposed, & receiued as equall in authority with the Diuine Scriptures. Againe, it is vndeniable; that the whole Church of Rome at this day doth acknowledge the Pope, for no other head, but an absolute, Sovereigne, Supreme: For the Scepter of Christ, whereby hee swayes and governes his Church, is his word: but this word the Pope hath assumed into his owne power, to giue sense and authority vnto it, as him pleaseth, so as the Spirit of the word must bee no other, but the Spirit of the Pope, from whom the Church of Rome must not appeale to Christ and his Spirit, ruling in, and by the Scriptures. Tell me, M *Cholmeley*, doth, or dare any in and of the Church of Rome at this day appeale from the Church, or Pope, to the Scriptures, for decission of any point of faith?

Se Sexti. de E-  
lectione tit. 6.  
Fundamenta.  
One of Nizol.  
3. his Pontificall  
decrees irrefra-  
gable. &c.



How then doe they acknowledge the Pope only for a subordinate and Ministeriall Head? Or how, or wherein doe they ascribe any prerogative to Christ about the Pope in matters of faith? Nay, doe they not say, that Christ and the Pope haue one consistory. But some Parasites say so. No doubt Pope Nichol. 3. hath decreed it irrefragably, that Peter was assumed into the fellowship of the individuall vnity, to be one with Christ, to wit, one Head, one foundation of the Church. *vt supra sexti. ibid.* And when the old pie so chattereth, will not M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeley allow a whole nest full of parasites to make the like, as Annon birds, which himselfe taught to sing, *Annon est Deus. Alian. lib. 14. cap. 3.* Nay is not Christ and his Spirit, together with the scepter of his word, quite excluded from their Magisteriall office, while the Pope usurpes their whole authority ypon himselfe alone?

Thirdly, your comparison of flesh and Spirit in the regenerate man, how impertinent and absurd it is, every one may judge: For, as these two are not separate, so (say you) in the Church of Rome there is an inseparable conjunction of Babylon and the people of God. So? How then shall Gods people obey Christs voyce, saying, *Come out of Babylon, my people,* if their conjunction with Babylon bee inseparable? Or how can any members of the Pope, not receiue Apostacie from him? For if the head fall into a pit, what becomes of the body, trow you, while it is inseparably conjoynd vnto it? Reade *Revel. 14. 9. 10. 11.* Or can the same people receiue grace from Christ, and Apostacie from Antichrist? For *by grace we stand*, but by Apostacy men fall away. And how can M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeley teach vs by any distinction to belecue, that the same people, at the same time, in the same estate, may both stand by grace, and fall away by apostacy? How can these two *aduersaries*, and contradictories stand together? *Flesh* and *Spirit* are compatible in the *Regenerate*: but not so *Grace* and *Apostacy*. Besides, it behooues M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeley first to proue

proue that there is an inseparable conjunction betweene Gods people and Babylon; or that any of the members of Babylon, or of the Pope, *the Antichrist*, are Gods people, indued with grace. For wee haue already proued, that the councell of Trent hath destroyed and denyed the sa-  
 uing faith of Christ in Babylon, without which, and the preaching thereof, how can any become Gods people?

Proceede wee:

*The third Argument:*

*A true visible Church hath the true markes of a true vi-*

*M. Cholmeley. pag. 21.*

*But the Church of Rome hath not those true markes:*

*Ergo. The Assumption is to be denied, which he proneth partly from the doctrine of the Church of England, partly from Bellarmine.*

*Reply.*

Now M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeley, what say you to the doctrine of the Church of England? you answered, *these wordes must receiue a favourable construction, or else they make as much against him, as against vs*; and with such construction they make more for vs, then for him. How, M Cholmeley? first, *they must be understood of the accidentall truth, in regard of soundnesse, (as the wordes doe expressly import) and not of essentiall truth, in regard of Gods covenant.* Stay there, *Accidentall truth*? Is the pure and sound doctrine of Gods word *Accidentall truth*? An *Accident*, we know, may be separated from the *Subiect*, without the destruction of the *Subiect*. But can a true Church subsist without the sound doctrine of Gods word? No, saith our Church. Or is sound doctrine an *Accident*, but *inseparable*? How then comes it to be separated from the Church of Rome, as our Church affirmeth? Or is not the sound doctrine of Gods word *essentiall truth*? And is it not the word of Gods Covenant? yea is it not the Testament of Christ? How then doth M Cholmeley limit it to *Accidentall* only,



*M. Cholm-* and not allow it to bee essentiall? But hee hath a second an-  
*ley. pag. 22.* swere: *Secondly they must bee understood even of sound-*  
*nesse comparatiuely, and not simply, that is, in regard of the*  
*Primitiue Church, and not otherwise: Else hee must grant,*  
*that the Church of Rome hath not beene a true visible Church*  
*these nine hundred yeares: whereas he allowes it to haue beene*  
*so, till the Councell of Trent, as appeareth in all this discourse.*  
*How? Comparatiuely in regard of the Primitiue Church,*  
*and not otherwise? Nay, simply, say I, in regard of the Pa-*  
*pacy, and not otherwise. For to that haue the words in the*  
*homily reference onely, saying, that for fault of the true*  
*markes, it had not beene a true Church, for the space of*  
*nine hundred yeares past, to that time. Where the Homily*  
*alludes to the first Pope, who vsurped the name and title*  
*of Vniuersall Head of the Church, Boniface the third; at him*  
*began the Papacy, and so Antichristian Apostacie of the*  
*Church of Rome, which had continued and growne about*  
*nine hundred yeares, when the Homily was compiled. From*  
*that time it was, that preaching began more notoriously*  
*to be adulterated, and the Sacraments by degrees sophisti-*  
*cated, and the Discipline of the Church corrupted. But by*  
*this reason you would inferre, that the Church of Rome*  
*should then haue beene no true Church this nine hundred*  
*yeares now, and vpward, which (you say) wee grant.*  
*Where doe I say in all my discourse, or in any part of it,*  
*that the papacy was a true Church, till the Councell of Trent?*  
*No, I say, till the Councell of Trent, there was a true*  
*Church in the Papacy: But now I say, vpon and since the*  
*Councell of Trent, the whole Church of Rome, roote &*  
*branch, head and taile, is wholly transformed into the*  
*Papacie. The soule of the Papacie is tota in toto, & tota*  
*in qualibet parte, is whole in the whole, and whole in euery*  
*part, and member of that Papall body.*

*M. Cholme-* Now for Bellarmine, I am sorry such a superficial Reader  
*ley.* should meddle with him, to the shame of our whole nation.

*Reply.*

## Reply.

M *Cholmeley*, if downeright rayling, and vnlimited reproching of your brother, were not the strongest Argument, that you haue brought as yet, or can bring for the defence of your wretched causes wee could haue wished, that for the honour of God, for the peace of your Mother Church, for brotherly charity sake, for your owne credit, and for the reputation of him, whom you specially labour so to vindicate, you had beene altogether silent.

But shew vs your profoundnesse, M *Cholmeley*, in your reading of *Bellarmino*. Haue I not noted him right? But you deny this to be a good consequence: *Bellarmino* disclaimes these 3 notes of the Church, as proper markes of the Church of Rome: Ergo, the Church of Rome hath them not. But the Church of England denies them to the Church of Rome: *Bellarmino* confesseth it; and (this being true) is this no good consequence? where is your Logick now? But say you, may not a man disclaime that which he hath, for some sinister respect best knowne to himselfe? as pride and presumption in meddling in causes, and with persons too high for him, and the like? And why might not M *Cholmeley* say as well, May not a man disclaime himselfe to be a freind of Babylon, even while he stoutly pleads for her, for some sinister respects best knowne to himselfe, there being more to be got (one way) for defending of some mens reputation, then for the honour of Christ, and of his Church? But say, that either *Bellarmino*, or the Church of Rome her self did arrogate these 3 markes to themselves: were it therefore a good consequence, Ergo, the Church of Rome is a true visible Church, notwithstanding the Church of England say the contrary?

Secondly, (saith M *Cholmeley*) doth *Bellarmino* disclaime them simply, and not onely in comparison of meere proper markes? All your distinctions will not serue the turne,



turne, to proue, that the Church of Rome hath these 3 marks, either simply, or cōparatiuely: our Church simply denieth them to the Church of Rome: & will you stand in comparifon against your Mother? And it fufficeth, that *Bellarmino* denies these to bee proper marks; and our Church sets them downe for proper marks, whereby to know all true Churches.

Thirdly (say you) *May not the Church of Rome haue them as marks common to all Churches, true and false, though not as proper to the true Church?* But the Church of England tels you againe and againe, that the Church of Rome hath not these marks no way: Againe, are these marks common to all Churches, true and false? How then doe these marks distinguish the true Church, from the false? Or, are not these the proper marks of the true Church? I looked at length for some solider reasons, and not for such poore sophismes, and pittifull non-senses.

M. Cholmley

Fourthly, (say you) *doth not Bellarmine de Ecclesia, lib. 3. cap. 2. Nostra autem sententia* (contradicting himselfe) *put these three into the definition of the Church? and doth hee not by them distinguish the Church from all other sortes of men whatsoever? Professione vera fidei, sacramentorum communione, subiectione ad proprium Pastorem?*

### Reply

In this allegation of M. Cholmeley out of *Bellarmino*, note (good Reader) first his falsification, in setting downe *Bellarmino's* words, which (according to *Bellarmino*) are, *Professio vera fidei, Sacramentorum communio, & subiectio ad legitimum Pastorem Romanum Pontificem*: that is, Profession of the true faith, communion of Sacraments, and subiection to the lawfull Pastor the Bishop of Rome. Secondly,

condly note his false explication and application of these 3. as equivalent to those, which our Church sets downe for workes of the true Church, and denies them to be in the Church of Rome.

The Church of Englands markes:

- 1 Pure and sound doctrine.
- 2 The Sacraments ministred according to Christs holy institution.
- 3 The right vse of Ecclesiasticall Discipline.

The Church of Romes Markes.

- 1 Profession of the true faith.
- 2 Communion of Sacraments.
- 3 Subjection to the lawfull Pastor, the Bishop of Rome.

Now doth M. Cholmeley put no more difference betweene *pure and sound doctrine*; and the bare *Profession of the true faith*; betweene the *Sacraments ministred according to Christs holy institution*, and the *Communion of the Sacraments*; betweene the *right vse of Ecclesiasticall Discipline*; and *subiection to the Lawfull Pastor, the Bishop of Rome*? No, no more. For whereas *Bellarmino de Notis Ecclesie*, disclames those three notes, alleaged by the Church of England: *here*, (sayth M. Cholmeley) *he contradicts him selfe*; confessing those three notes to be in the Church of Rome; and yet they are no other, but as wee haue seene. M. Cholmeley must pardon me, that I am so bold with him to detect his manner of dealing in defending *Bellarmino*, and the Church of *Rome*; for else I might deserue that aspertion, which hee hath so peremptorily, proudly, and past all shame cast vpon mee, and which I must craue leaue to returne, where it is most due, and there leaue it: *I am sorry such a superficiall Reader should meddle with Bellarmino to the shame of our whole Nation.*

Pag. 22.

Fistly, is it not a Maxime of *Bellarmino*, lib. 1. de sacram. M. Cholmeley. pag. 23. *Respondeo, Sacramenta*, That the Sacraments, and the word of God, and the rest, *Solius* *semper*



*semper esse Ecclesia, etiamsi interdum extra Ecclesiam inueniatur?* What dealing then is this, to play the sophister so palpably, *à dicto secundum quid, ad dictum simpliciter?* This is his third Argument.

*Reply.*

*Bellarmino* in the fore alleaged place sayth, that the sacraments are alwaies proper to the Church, although sometimes they be found without the Church. But I know not what *M. Cholmley* can conclude from hence, vnlesse by adding this clause to the former, hee would inferre, that the Church of Rome is the onely Church (for so *Bellarmino* makes it) and that consequently the Church of England, which doth not acknowledge the Pope for her lawfull Pastor, hath no right to the word and Sacraments, and the rest as being proper and peculiar to the one and onely Church of Rome, out of which the Church of Engiand (blessed bee God) is. Hee might thanke his distinction, so frequent with him, *à dicto secundum quid ad dictum simpliciter*, the better bestowed in this place, if it could saue him harmelesse from the rebutting of his owne dart vpon himselfe; *what dealing is this, to play the Sophister so palpably?*

*M. Cholmley. pag. 24.*

*The fourth you shall find pag. 35. to this purpose. If the Church of Rome cannot demonstrate it selfe to bee a true Church, then it is no true Church:*

*But it cannot: Ergo.*

*Reply.*

Stay: before we passe further let vs examine, if any such Argument bee to bee found, or may bee formed from the quoted place of my 7 vials, pag. 35. Indeed there are these words: *If the Church of Rome then cannot demonstrate it selfe to be a true Church* (and no maruaile sith it wants the right demonstratiue markes) *why should we take the paines, to be so officious as to pin a true visible Church vpon her sleene?*

This

This is that I say. From whence M. Cholmley might have framed this Argument.

If the Church of Rome cannot demonstrate it selfe to be a true Church, then it ill becomes M. Cholmley or any Minister of the Church of England to plead Babe's cause, and to go about to proue her a true Church:

But the Church of Rome cannot do it: Ergo.

But other inference M. Cholmley cannot (without violence) make of my words, that *because she Church of Rome cannot demonstrate her selfe a true Church, therefore shee is no true Church*. This argument then being of M. Cholmleys owne devising, & not mine, I envy him not the inioying of his answere without other confutation.

Onely whereas he quarrels me againe (pag. 25,) as dealing vntruly with Bellarmine, (whom hee is so curious and punctuall to defend in all points) he not hauing, Only; let me also set downe Bellarmines words; who speaking of his 15 markes, saith, *Non quidem efficiunt euidenter verum, ipsam esse veram Dei Ecclesiam, sed tamen efficiunt id euidenter credibile*. These 15 notes do not indeede make it euidently true, that it is the true Church of God, but yet they make it euidently credible. Here then let the Reader judge, what wrong I haue done Bellarmine by, Only; the sense being equivalent and the same, as I haue briefly rendred it. And againe he sayth, *Dicimus ergo, Notas Ecclesie, quas adferemus, non facere euidentiam veritatis simpliciter, &c. Sed tamen efficiunt euidentiam credibilitatis*; Wee say then, that the notes of the Church, which wee will bring, doth not make euidence of the trueth simply &c: but yet they make euidence of credibility. But whereas M. Cholmley would inferre, *the euidence credible*, to Pagans; but *the euidently true*, as well as *euidently credible*, to Christians: there is no such thing expressed in Bellarmine, of making euidently credible to Pagans: and, *for euidently true to Christians*, it is in respect of their admitting of diuine Scriptures, and histories, and the writings of ancient

Bellar. de Notis  
Eccles. cap. 3.



Fathers: Thus the Reader may see the humor of M<sup>r</sup> *Cholmley*, how quarrelous towards his brother, how zealous for *Bellarmino*, adding some thing more, pag. 26: but I will not trouble you with every trifle.

He proceeds in pag. 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, beating the ayre about Popish *Invention*, and my braines going about to teach me this point, what difference there is among Pontificians about it. I leave him to reconcile them. Onely I will here set downe the Canon of the Councell of Trent, for confirmation of what I have sayd: *Si quis dixerit in*

Sess. 7. can. 11. *Ministri, dum sacramenta conficiunt, & conferunt, non requirunt Intentionem saltem faciendi, quod facit Ecclesia: anathema sit:* If any say, that in the Ministers, while they consecrate, and conferre the Sacraments, is not required an Intention at least of doing, what the Church doth: let him be accursed.

A Vega lib. 9.  
de incertitudine gratiae cap.  
15.

I could wish M<sup>r</sup> *Cholmley* had read their commentaries vpon this Canon: *Vega* shewes it at large in his Trent-Commentary: where among many other instances he hath this, out of *Gabriel Biel*, *Non posse quengnam &c.* That no man can be certaine of his justification, although it might suffice not to put a barre, that wee might obtaine grace by the Sacrament of penance, because the Intention of the Absoluer cannot be evident to any, And *ibid. cap. 17, Quinto*: Fifthly, the most safe and certaine way given vs to justification, are the Sacraments. But it cannot appeare to none by faith, that he hath receiued euen the least Sacrament. And this is so certaine to bee beleued, as its cleare that we liue. *Nulla quippe est via &c.* For there is no way, by which, without Revelation wee can know the intention of the Minister, either evidently or certainly by faith. And this *Vega* there groundeth vpon the foresayd Canon of *Trent*. Read also the learned *Chemnitius*, in his second part, of *intention*; where hee sheweth that the Trent Canon of the Priests *Intention*, ouerthroweth all faith, and therefore of no small moment, howsoever M.

*Cholmley*

*Cholmley* make light of it, and labours to qualifie and excuse it.

Pag. 29.

And after *Intention*, hee comes to *Certainty*, where hee seemeth to bee acquainted with *Vega*, and other Schoole *Divines*, in that he shakes hands with them in the point of morall and coniecturall certainty. Now surely, how it fareth with M. *Cholmley*, I know not, but for my part I see not, why any man, not onely a Minister, but any sensible or reasonable man should without blushing, lay or joyne these two together, *Coniecturall certainty*. And yet this is all that *certainty*, which M. *Cholmley* can bring, to proue, that all and euery Papist. may demonstrate himselfe to haue receiued true baptisme, as being *conjecturally certaine* both that hee was baptized, and of the *Priests intention*. And besides, hee addeth, that it is twenty to one, but one Papist or other hath a *Reuelation of the Priests Intention*. But one swallow makes not the spring: nor can one M. *Cholmeley*, make any one Papist more then coniecturally certaine of his Baptisme, vnlesse he can borrow, or bring some clearer revelation for it, then yet wee see.

The last Argument pag 31. is this,

'That Church which wants the ordinary meanes of  
'Saluation, is not true Church.

M. *Cholm-*

'But the Church of Rome wants the Ordinary meanes  
'of saluation, the preaching and hearing of the Gospell,  
'yea it teacheth hers to hate and abhorre it, and to call it  
'heresy. Ergo.

ley. pag. 31.

'I answered, they want it, and they want it not: they hate  
'it, and they hate it not: they want & hate the soundnes &  
'purity thereof, as it is enioyed in the reformed Churches:  
'but they neither want nor hate it, as it is corrupted by  
'their own Traditions, which cannot wholly deprive it of  
'all sauing vertue. And why (I pray) should we not be con-  
'tent in common commiseration to beare with the in this  
'case, as wee do with those people, which dwell in fenny,



‘ foggy and marish grounds, and Countries, who comming  
 ‘ into places of fresh aire, and healthy diet, do complaine,  
 ‘ that it is not good nor wholsome, because it agrees not  
 ‘ with their more grosse constitution? If another man liue  
 ‘ by poysoned meates, I will not envy him, so long as I  
 ‘ feed on that which is sound and mans meate (as we say.)  
 ‘ And so much for his Arguments.

*Reply.*

Wee see, how M. *Cholmleys* answers are drawne so dry,  
 that he is come to the last lees and dregges of flatte contra-  
 dictions. Nor do I know whether it may stand with my  
 credit to make any reply to this last answer, it being no  
 lesse ridiculous, then the rest fabulous. *They want it, and  
 they want it not: they hate it, and they hate it not.* How? *They  
 want and hate the soundnesse and purity thereof.* This is e-  
 nough. If they want and hate this, they want and hate all  
 that is good. *But they neither want nor hate it, as it is corrup-  
 ted by their owne Traditions, which cannot wholly deprive it  
 of all saving vertue as hath beene already proved.* Yes  
 M. *Cholmley*, for as it is thus corrupted, they want it,  
 sith their corruptions are preferred before and aboue it.  
 Nor doe they loue it for any other respect, (if for any at  
 all) but because it is corrupted. They loue it not then for it  
 selves sake, but for the corruptions sake. So that if you can  
 bring no better proofes, then hitherto; you will draw our  
 commiseration vpon your selfe, which wee deny not also  
 to the Church of Rome But because we commiserate her,  
 shall it not be a foolish pittie, to delude our selues in allow-  
 ing her a true Church, which (you confesse) both wants  
 and hates soundnesse of doctrine? your fenny and foggy  
 comparison, and that of poysoned meates, wee leaue, as  
 best agreeable to popish constitutions, who cannot brooke  
 the pure ayre and wholsome food of Gods word: hoping,  
 that the purer ayre and diet of your Portion of Clare, will  
 in time purge out the poyson, which you haue sipped  
 from

from the Babylonish cup.

*Thus haue I shewed M. Burtons second point of Disorder M. Cholmeley in misplacing his Arguments; and haue, as well as I can, right-ley. pag. 32. ed it, and answered them.*

*Reply.*

Howsoeuer I haue *misplaced my Arguments*, sure I am you haue misapplied your answeres, as euery iudicious Reader will witnesse. So that all the right you haue done me, is this, that your answeres haue left my Arguments as intire and full, as you found them, and haue now prouoked me the more to confirme them, by convincing and confuting your more then absurd answeres: wherein that I must craue any pardon, it is, for filing my fingers with such vnworthie stuffe.

' The third and last followes, which are his idle Repeti-  
' tions, and tautologies, &c. Now here I must craue fauour *M. Cholmeley. ibid.*  
' of the Christian Reader, that (being constrained by the  
' misbehauour of our Adversary, to lay open his foule  
' ouersights, in charging the Church of Rome, the Coun-  
' cell of Trent, and *Bellarmino* with vntruthes, which hee  
' ought not to haue done) he would not suppose me to bee  
' any whit inclined or addicted to Popery, as the manner  
' of the world is now a dayes. No, I praise God, I am as  
' farre from Popery, as M. Burton himselfe is, or canne  
' bee. &c.

*Reply.*

But M. *Cholmeley* shewes not those idle Repetitions, or tautologies, or at least he proceedes not to confute them: which if hee doe, will not his answers trow you proue *idle Repetitions and tautologies*. But these hee will impute to mine. And why may not I as well impute my repetitions, if any, to the occasion giuen mee? But as for your suit to the Christian Reader, M. *Cholmeley* you must know that a Diuine of the Church of England, pleading for the  
Church



Church of *Rome*, and playing her Advocate, as you haue done must not expect that priuiledge, which many Advocates or Pleaders take to themselves in Westminster Hall, who when they haue pleaded stoutly for a bad cause, for which they haue the bigger fee, would yet bee accounted for as honest men, as they bee learned Lawyers. But it is *the manner of the world now adayes to misdeeme such as you are, as inclining or addicted, somewhat at least to Popery.* And can you blame it, when it is the manner of the world now adayes, that Ministers of the Church of England are so forward to take vp the bucklers for the Church of *Rome*? Instead therefore of praising God for your innocencie in this point, I could wish you to pray vnto him to pardon you this scandall, which you haue brought vpon your Mother Church, thereby giuing iust occasion to all that know and loue to account you as one inclining and addicted more then somewhat *to Popery.* So that if you were as farre from Popery, as M. *Burton*, you would neuer haue put pen to paper to paint and decke that strumpet, which M. *Burton* (he blefseth God) neuer yet did.

*But you haue beene hitherto constrained by the misbehaviour of your aduersary, to lay open his foule ouersights.* This is belike that misbehaviour mentioned in your Epistle Dedicatory. Well, you haue beene constrained. And surely I easily belecue, you would not willingly (see the mishap of it) instead of laying open your Aduersaries foule ouersights, haue so palpably discovered to all the world your profound ignorance, (if not impiety) in so defending the Councell of Trent, Bellarmine &c. Do not then, do not, henceforth maintaine bad causes for the Church of *Rome*, wherein you haue verified your owne words, *to maintaine bad causes with worse arguments.* What we haue defended against her, it is not M. *Cholmleyes* 7 dayes, no nor 7 yeares Defence can ouerthrow it. And where you say, *It is an excellent point of manhood, to let the enemy haue his utmost due, and not to seeke to overcome him by base and cowardly* means:

meanes: O M. *Cholm.* when you first advanced your crest as a champion for the Church of Rome. did you not think that you were to deale with an Adversary bound hand and foote, to whom it should not be easie to vse his weapon in open field against you? if so, where is your manhood to vse such base & cowardly meanes, as calumniations and vilifications of your brother, all along, who in this cause desires nothing but freedome and faire play, from the Marshalls of the field to cope with you. But if you purpose to do hereafter, as you haue done, and as you professe, surely the good Reader (whom you againe sollicite) will not bee pleased to belecue you; as being an vnreasonable motion; perceiuing too well, that you haue both abused him and your Adversary, yea and your Lord too (whose cause you haue vndertaken) and in fine your selfe in vndertaking it. But what enemy doe you meane, to whom we deny his vtmost due? The Church of Rome, because wee deny her to be a true Church? But that which is vndue giue mee leaue to deny to an enemy, who is ready to assume beyond all measure, more thē is due vnto him: & for which cause Gods true Church shal one day strip that strūpet of all her stolne stuffe. In the following page 34, 35, 36, the Reader finding nothing but meere cauls, I passe thē ouer, as answered before. In pag. 37, 38, 39. M. *Chol.* bringeth a whole catalogue of Protestant Authors to sway the ballance on his side. But whence doth he take them: Not from his owne particular reading & obseruation, but in grosse, & by heapes, as they are billed vp by the Popish Authors, as *Brierlie*, & *Smith*; it is one thing what Popish Authors quote from Protestants, another what Protestants themselues acknowledge. Why should not M. *Cholm.* haue examined the truth concerning those authors, before he put them in his skale? My reason is, because in many of those Authors by him billed, I haue by prooffe in some, such as I haue at hand, found it to bee quite contrary, & so belonging to my skale. For instance: The Augustane Confession in the former Articles *Disp. 8. de Eccles.* 2. 11. sayth, *Quod Pape Ecclesia sit malignantium Ecclesia,*



*item regnum Antichristi*: That the Papall Church, or of the Pope, is the Church of the malignant, and the Kingdome of Antichrist. See also Num. 12. & 13. where it is said in the yeare 1530, *Necessity was laide upon our publick Confessours*, that in the theatre of the whole Christian Empire, they should clearly expresse their mind concerning this necessary Head of Christian doctrine, that all Christians might know, what was the true Head of the Church, and how the members are incorporated into the true Head of the true Church, and that they might learne to avoide counterfeit Heads, and altogether discern which was the true, which the false Church. So the Augustan confession. And in this was both *Luthers* opinion & many more, both contained, & expressly mentioned: Here-

\* As the Helvetian, 1 & 2 Basil, Bohemian, French, English, Belgick, Augustan, Saxon, Wirtemberg, Swecue.

\* Controv, 2. quæst, 6. cap. 1.

unto we might add the \* *Harmony of Confessions*, wherein in effect, eleven severall confessions of so many Protestant Churches, wherof this of *England* is one, shew the Church of Rome to be no true Church. All which alone, were sufficient to counterpoise M *Cholmleyes* skale. But examine we some few more of his Authors alledged by his *Brierly* & *Smith*, a little more to ease and lighten his skale, M *Hooker* saith plainly, that in the point of Iustificatiō (which is the fundamental doctrine of saluation) the Church of Rome overthroweth the foundation, & extinguisheth the force of the blood of Iesus Christ. How then is it a true Church?

\* D<sup>r</sup> *Whitaker* handling this question punctually: *An Ecclesia Romana sit vera Ecclesia Christi visibilis*, whether the Church of Rome be a true visible Church of Christ: in stating the question, saith thus: *Eam nos non modo non solā Catholicam, &c.* We say it is not only not the only Catholick, but not at all Catholick, nor only not Catholick, to wit, universal, but we contend, it is not a true particular Church of Christ. *Quare deserendam esse dicimus ab omnibus &c.* Wherefore we say, she ought to be forsake of all men, who will be saued, as the Synagogue of Antichrist and Satan. And a little after, *It is not any Church at all, nor any saluation to be hoped from it, Nullam in ea salutem sperandam esse.* I set downe

downe D<sup>r</sup> *Whitakers* owne words, because to M<sup>r</sup> *Cholmley* mine seeme Buggs wordes, and neuer heard or vttered before, causing M<sup>r</sup> *Cholmley* to tremble, as hee sayth, when we say that *no saluation is to bee found in her the Church of Rome.* But by that time that M<sup>r</sup> *Cholmley* hath in speciall perused with these I haue named, all the rest mentioned in grosse by him, taken vp vpon trust from Popish Authors, I trust hee will grow so well inured with this opinion and speech, as he will not be afraide to take it vp, and be of the same minde too. Then shall he know and acknowledge, that M<sup>r</sup> *Burton*, is not the first that hath vsurped this assertion, nor goes alone in it. The same D<sup>r</sup> *Whitakers*, Cap. 3. goes on to proue this his Assertion, in regard of the Head of that Church, the Pope, whom he proueth to bee no true Bishop, as 1 being no true Teacher. 2 assuming the power of Vniuersall Bishop: 3 being the true Antichrist, and therefore that Church which adheres to him as Head, is Antichristian. And for the members, they are (sayth he) either the Cleargy, or the Laity: the Cleargy are either Bishops or Priests. These are like their Head, no true Bishops, &c. Whence this Argument: *Vbi nullum, &c.* Where there is no lawfull Ministry, there is no Church: But among the Papists is no lawfull Ministry, therefore among the Papists no Church. Then hee proues it from the people, as differing nothing from Turkes, and Pagans, and Iewes, but in the bare name of Christians. From the parts, hee descends to the whole Body, consisting of Head and Members, and proues the Church of Rome jointly to bee no Catholicke, no Apostolicke, not one, not a holy Church, as from the Councell of Constantinoples foure Notes. *For shee holdes not the Catholicke Apostolicke Faith, because shee hath not the pure preaching of the Word, and the right and lawfull administration of the Sacraments obserued by the Apostles, and instituted of Christ. They overthrow the foundation, to wit, iustification by faith, and many other foundations to the number of 18, set downe by D<sup>r</sup> Whitakers:*



*takers*: therefore they cannot be faued, sayth he, persifiting therein: *Ergo, nulla Ecclesia*. For M. Perkins, I referre the Reader to his Exposition vpon the Creed, the holy Catholicke Church, the two last leaues, where hee proues the Church of Rome no true Church. His wordes are (stating the question, as we doe) *As for the assemblies of of Papists, which haue beene a great part of the world, if thereby wee vnderstand companies of men holding the Pope for their Head, and beleeuing the Councell of Trent, they are called Churches, but in deede they are no true, or sound members of the Catholick Church. For both in the doctrine, and in the worship of God, they raze the very foundation of Religion, which will appeare by these Notes:* as in the point of Iustification &c. King James calls the Church of Rome Babylon. P. Martyr, The Kingdome of Antichrist. D. Willet (though not heere billed) in his Synopsis, plainly sheweth, and that by many sound Arguments, the Church of Rome to bee no true Church. Where in the name of all Protestants, he sayth,

See Willets Syn-  
opsis controu.  
2. of the church  
quæst. 5. part. 2  
The Church of  
Rome is not a  
true visible  
Church.

#### The Protestants:

*Wee deny utterly, that they are a true visible Church of CHRIST, but an Antichristian Church, and an Assemblie of Heretickes, and enemies to the Gospell of IESVS CHRIST.* D. Carleton also, the late reverend Bishop of Chichester, in his learned booke *de Ecclesia* plainly proueth, and concludeth, that the Church of Rome hath no communion with the Catholicke Church of CHRIST. But to confine my selfe to the Authours billed and catalogued by Brierly for M. Cholmley, and that wee may not weary the Reader in setting downe euery particular Authors Opinion, wee will close vp all with the verdict of the reverend D. Field, one of the Muster, who in an answer to Bellarmines objecting the confession of Protestants, to proue the *Romane Synagogue* (to vse D. Fields owne

owne words) to bee the true Church of God: in his 47 Chapter of the 3<sup>d</sup> Booke of the Church, the title whereof is, *Of the Protestants pretended confession, that the Romane Church is the true Church of God*: hee sayth, *Surely if Bellarmine can proue, that wee confesse it to bee the true Church, he needeth not vse any other arguments. Let vs see therefore how he proueth, that wee confesse the Romane Church to be the true Church of God.* Luther (sayth hee) clearelyeeldeth it, and Calvin, and others in effect acknowledge the same. This we deny &c. Reade the whole Chapter. This may suffice to answere M. Cholmleyes Bill of Protestants, among who yet I muse he would ranke *Vorstius*, vnlesse it were to show the malice of the Popish alledgers, and not his owne good will to *Vorstius*, to giue him the honour to be set among so many Worthies. To conclude, the best prooffe, and all that M. Cholmley, or any other of his side, can produce from any Protestant Orthodox Diuines, is this, that God may haue a hidden Church in the Church of Rome, or in Babylon, whence they are bidden to flee. No man denyes this. But will or can any man hence conclude, that the Church of Rome is a true visible Church of Christ, because some liuing within the pale of that Synagogue, are of the number of Christs secret ones? Then he may as well conclude, that because Gods Church is in the world, therefore the world wherein it is, is the true visible Church of God.

As for M. Cholmleyes scoffs & sarcafmes pag. 40, as if it were no perillous advantage at all giuen to the Papists, thus to defend them for a true Church; I leaue them to the censure of the wisest & best in our Church. *A perillous advantage, I promise you.* Is it not in good earnest, M. Cholmley, *a perillous advantage*, when your owne allegation whispers vnto vs, that Popish authors take advantage by billing vp so many Protestants, as you haue told vs of, as affirming the Church of Rome to be a true Church? Hath not the learned D. Field obserued it (as we haue noted) to be an Advantage, snatched at by *Bellarmino* himselfe?



Thus will they not be apt to say to you, if not, *Thy Mother Church of Rome*, yet at least, *Thy brother Benhadad*, or, *Thy sister Samaria*?

M.Ch. p.40 But you adde. *Whoever denied, but that we were sometimes members of the Church? And with what face can it be denied?*

Reply.

Who denies it? So wee were once the *Children of wrath*, the members of Satan. What will you inferre heere-vpon? We were *once darknes, but are now light in the Lord*. therefore is darknes light? But what *Wee* doth M. Cholmley meane? Doth he not meane our Forefathers in the state & time of Popery? Yes surely. Eor els, blessed be God, now the generall generation of the present Church of England were neuer members of that Church, that Synagogue of Rome, and I trust neuer shall bee. But of our Forefathers, before the Councell of Trent, wee haue spoken elsewhere.

Pag.41. what M. Cholmley saith of my words [*Popery hath learned to get over the stile againe fast enough without our helpe*] is so trifling, that I passe it ouer. Also pag.42,43. 44,45.46,47, I finde nothing but a bewraying of a nimble humour, apt to catch at shadowes, and to play at small play rather then sit out, if by any meanes hee may make his adversary contemptible. pag.46. he saith, *Indeed it cannot bee denied to bee a great fault for any man to meddle in matters too high, and with persons too great for him*. This obiection is of great vse with M. Cholmley, as both before, and pag.48, & 50. But first with persons I meddle not, whom I name not, but reverence as much, as M. Cholmley can doe: as for the Cause: Are the Mysteries of Religion too high for Ministers to meddle in. *Traſtent fabrilis Fabri. Nanita de venris, de tauris narrat arator*, &c. And may not any, must not Ministers bee exercised in the Mysteries of Divinity, the matter of their calling? I know not what priuiledge

M.

M. *Cholmley*, yea or yet (with due reverence be it spoken to their Lordships) the reverend Bishops haue about an ordinary and poore Minister of the Word, euen such as poore M. *Burton*, so vile in M. *Cholmleyes* eyes, to meddle, or (to speake more reverently) to handle, and treat of the high mysteries of Gods Word, whether they concerne the Mysteries of Christian godlinesse, or that of Antichristian impiety: vlesse M. *Cholmley* can prooue, that CHRIST gaue a greater power of the Keyes to *Peter*, then to the rest of the Apostles. Nor shall Master *Cholmleyes* supercilious wordes bee able to disanimate mee from labouring with the Preacher, according to my poore scātling to *become wise, & to search out, & set in order, acceptable words, and an upright writing, euen words of trueth.* So as my Ministry giues mee warrant sufficient to maintaine the trueth, and to refute the contrary, notwithstanding your objections, as if I wanted warrant, pag. 47. & 51. *And if any men, yea or Angell from Heauen* (sayth the Apostle, not I) *Preach otherwise, let him bee accursed.* The rest, pag. 48. 49. 50. 51. being of the same meale with the former, are not worth the boulding, as yeelding nothing but branne. Onely pag. 48, where hee sayth, *yet giue mee leaue to tell you, what I could say against you, if I were disposed:* Let mee say, that if euery hissing of M. *Cholmeley* were a sting, what would become of mee? Surely of your beeing disposed I doubt not, you haue giuen so good prooffe thereof: but how true your proofes or reproofes haue beene, I leaue to the ingenuous and christianly disposed Reader. Nay your apt and prompt disposition (as it seemeth) is such, as it makes mee belecue you haue not much behind to say, when onely you threaten to say it. And till your disposition serue to say more, I will suspend further answer, being alwayes as ready with all Christian ingenuity to acknowledge my errorrs, if there be just cause, as you disposed to tell mee of them. And as for mee (if you knewall) you shall find a  
strong



strong God in weake man.

M. *Cholm.* setting downe these words of mine : Yea  
 ' my profession, not onely as a Christian, but much more  
 ' as a Minister of the Gospell, bindes mee to it ;

M. *Ch.* p. 51

*Answers:*

' Then let all Christendome goe together by the eares, and  
 ' let Ministers be the ring-leaders and Boutefewes. .

*Reply.*

God forbid, M. *Cholm.* Are not you bound as a Minister of the Gospell, to defend the truth of Gods Word. Is not a part thereof to discouer vnto vs the Mystery of the great *Whoore*, and of *Antichrist*? And doe not you know, that the *Lambe*, and those *on his side*, the *called*, and *chosen*, and *faithfull*, doe warre with the *Beast*, & her confederate crew? Are they therefore Ring-leaders, Boutefewes? *Cave dixeris.*

M. *Cholm.*

Pag. 52, you conclude, that because some say it, that  
 ' therefore it is a thing of all other, which I had most neede  
 ' to purge my selfe of; namely; This contentious humour,  
 ' which (you doe say) is predominant in you, and so, pre-  
 ' sumptuous withall. If to contend for the truth, for the  
 faith, M. *Cholm.* bee a contentious humour with you, I tell  
 you, therein I will not yeeld to you an inch. You know by  
 this time, and will acknowledge it, that the truth is on my  
 side, for which I haue so earnestly contended, as *Iude* ex-  
 horteth. Indeed (as I suppose) earnestly to contend for a  
 bad cause, is a signe of a contentious humour. But before  
 you minister your purgation, you should do wel to ask my  
 Parishioners, whether this contentious humor be in me, or  
 no; whether either for tithes or any other matters I haue  
 gone to Law with any of them, or any other; least o-  
 therwise, the poyson of your potion, not meeting  
 with any such poysoned humour (for *venenum de-*

*nemo expellitur*) in stead of purging, may provoke the humour the more, & then at your perils be it: and take heed, least while you are so busie to purge out this contentious humour in me, it be found in your selfe predominant, and so the proverbe might be applied, *Physitian, heale thy self*: rather hearken to *Salomon*, *Contend not with a man without cause*, much lesse, contend in a bad cause.

Prov. 3.

Pag. 54. M. Cholmeley excepts against the Mystery of iniquity, as not compatible with a false Church. For (saith hee) *where is the mystery, if the Roman Church bee denied to be a true, or true visible Church of Christ?* I answer: Is not the false, and vsurped name of the one and only Catholicke Church sufficient to colour ouer the mystery of iniquity? Yea, this is the very mystery of iniquity (if M. Cholmeley vnderstand it not) for the whore of Babylon to goe vailed in the borrowed habit and title of the Catholicke Apostolicke Church.

And *ibid.* where I say, *that a kinde of necessity hath imposed this taske upon mee, to stand up against the Church of Rome*: M. Cholmeley, besides his ordinary gibing language in the next page hopeth hee shall make it appeare, that this necessity was neuer of Gods imposition. But I haue already made it appeare to the contrary, as before.

Pag. 60. (For I passe by his many interim idle times) M. Cholmeley quarrels mee, for putting the Religion of Rome, for the Church of Rome: So also Pag. 61. where I put in this question, *Whether any Papist by his religion can bee saued*: hee saith I thus diuide one question into two: For (saith hee) *the question is, whether any man liuing and dying in a Papist, or member of the Church of Rome, may bee saved: and not, whether any Papist may be saved by his Religion. This therefore is a trick of Legierdumain, worthy such as pretend Gods glory in hypocrisie.*

H

Reply.



## Reply.

M. *Cholmeleyes* Ishmaelitish scoffing, biting, calumniating language, I leaue to the judgement of Him that made the tongue for better vses. But what is a Church, but according to its religion. For by religion I meane not devotion, but doctrine, in both which the Church of Rome is so blind. So that my meaning is plaine enough, vnlesse to a perverse interpreter, that for a Papist to be saved as a Papist, it is, to be saved by the meanes of his Religion: so that if M. *Cholmeley* will lay his peevisheesse aside, his more refined reason, and better judgement will not finde herein what more to object.

But pag, 60. hee brings the authority of S<sup>t</sup> *Augustine* about Baptisme in these words, *Ecclesia Orthodoxa, non Heresis, per Christi Baptismum generat, qui generantur filii Dei etiam inter Hereticos.*

## Reply.

If this sentence thus alledged did any way make against vs, wee had just cause a little to quarrell M. *Cholmeley*, for not quoting the chapter whence he hath it. Thus Iesuites deale in their more generall allegations, to make vs either spend time, or loose our labour in seeking. I haue looked ouer the booke, and finde not this sentence: But wee will take it vpon trust: what would M<sup>r</sup> *Cholmeley* proue by it?

The Church of Rome to be a true Church, because it hath baptisme, and saving trueth, as hee glosseth vpon S<sup>t</sup> *Augustine*: For saving trueth wee haue already proued, they haue ouerthrowne it: For Baptisme in an Apostaticall, Schismaticall, hereticall Church, how farre that may joyne it to the Catholicke, or profit such an hereticall Church; let the same S<sup>t</sup> *Aug.* be vmpire, in the said booke; as cap. 1. *Apostates*, saith he, *may haue baptisme, so Schismatickes*

matickes and hereticke; but then Baptisme begins to profite them, when they come to be reconciled to the Church, which out of it, was unprofitably given. And chapter 12. Baptisme then profiteth for the remission of sinnes, where a man is reconciled to the unity of the Church, putting off the sacriledge of dissention, whereby his sinnes were holden. But this by the way; as it is offered, wee purpose, God willing, to handle this point of Baptisme, as it is in the Church of Rome, more fully in this ensuing treatise.

Pag. 62. M. Cholmeley layes vpon him, light where it will, either my Author must marre a good cause in the handling (it is pittie M. Cholmeley had not had the handling of so good a cause, hee hath plaid the champion so brauely) or I bely my Author: but he speakes at randome, and there I leaue him.

*Ibid.* he quarrels these words concerning a simple ignorant Papist: so then if a Papist be saued, he may thanke his ignorance.

Of this M. Cholmeley makes a wonderment: he brings S. Paul for instance; and therefore bids me, Apage.

#### Reply.

For Apage, he may giue it to his dogge. But why doth hee so wilfully divide my words from the true expresse sense: let him looke well whence hee hath them, namely, Vials, pag. 30. Answer: and so (to vie his phrase elsewhere) let him lay his hand vpon his mouth.

Pag. 63. he sets downe my words: But Christ the foundation is there professed: well: but how will Popish ignorance teach a man to bee saued by Christ? Faith comes by hearing, and without faith no salvation by Christ: But all Papists are taught to hate and abhorre the preaching of the word; how then is it possible they should be saued? be they neuer so humble and peaceable men.

M. Cholmeley

To this M. Cholmeley answereth, The farther, the worse, &c, and fie for shame, that a man so well studied in the myste-



ry of iniquity, should be either so ignorant therein, or so ill affected to affirme so grosse an untrueth as that the Papists haue not the saving or iustifying faith, and the meanes of obtaining it, to wit, the preaching of the word of God. Reade the Councell of Trent, Sess. 5. cap. 2. & 24. cap. 4.

Reply.

Decretum de  
Reformatione,  
cap. 1. Sess. 5.

For your, *The farther the worse*, M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeley, wee shall see by and by to whom it properly belongeth: for the rest, beware least it bee not also retorted vpon you thus: *Fie for shame, that a man professing to be such an aduersarie to Babylon, should yet bee so ignorant of the maine cause, why hee should hate and detest her.* I haue read ouer your places alledged, to wit, Sess. 5. cap. 2. & Sess. 24. cap. 4. where I finde a Decree of Reformation *to preach (what?) Sanctum Iesu Christi Evangelium*, the holy Gospell of Iesus Christ. This is somewhat. But doth M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeley take all this for good Gospell? I must intreat him to looke backe in the fourth Session, *Decretum de Canonis Scripturis, ut ablatiis erroribus, puritas ipsa Evangelii in Ecclesia conseruetur, &c.* That errours being remoued, the purity it selte of the Gospell may bee conserued in the Church. Of singular care and zeale! to preserue the purity it self of the Gospell of Iesus Christ! Well. But what might this Gospell, and the very puritie thereof meane? What? The counsell there tels you: *Perspiciensq, &c.* And beholding this trueth and discipline to bee contained in Bookes written, and in Traditions vnwritten, &c. These jointly, written and unwritten, as pertayning both to faith and maners, the Sacrosanct Oecumeniall and Generall Councell of Trent, doth with equall affection of pietie and reuerence, *veretur & veneratur*, religiously embrace. Loe here, that which M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeley piously tooke even now for the holy Gospell of Iesus Christ, is here the Gospell of the holy Synod of Trent, such a Gospell, as never was decreed in a generall Councel before:

before. This Gospell then must henceforth bee preached vniverſally in the Church of Rome, as the rule of faith and maners, and that (forſooth) by a Decree of *Reformatio*. But beſides all this, it is added there, *Si verò, quod abſit Predicator errores, aut ſcandala diſſeminaverit in populum, &c.* But if, which farre be it, the Preacher ſhall ſow errorrs or ſcandals among the people, although he preach in his owne Monastery, or of any other order, let the Biſhop forbid him to preach; *Quod ſi hereses predicaverit, contra eum, &c.* If hee ſhall preach heresies, let the Biſhop proceede againſt him, according to courſe of law, or the cuſtome of the place, yea although the Preacher himſelfe pretend his exemption by generall or ſpeciall privilege. According alſo hereunto is that other place, alledged *Seſſ. 24. cap. 4.* Now to ſumme vp all: I would gladly know of M. *Cholm.* what bee thoſe errorrs and heresies, which muſt not bee preached in the Church of Rome. Hee muſt confeſſe, will he, nill he, all thoſe, which the holy Synod of Trent hath decreed and accuſed for heresies. For this, I muſt put him to the trouble of reading over the whole Canons of Trent. But to ſave the vnpartiall and ingenuous Reader the labour, I will mention a few inſtead of all the reſt. For the purpoſe, the grand heresies defined and branded by the Councell of Trent, are theſe: *To bee iuſtified by Chriſts imputative righteousneſſe: to bee iuſtified by faith onely: to haue ſuch a faith, as is a ſure affiance and confidence in Gods mercy: to abhorre all kinde of merits, either of condignity or congruity: to reſuſe to invoke Angels and Saints, as Mediators: to reſuſe to worſhip Images, and Reliques: not to beleene Chriſts body, fleſh, blood & bone to be really or carnally preſent in the Eucharist: not to worſhip that contained vnder the Accidents of the bread with diuine worſhip: not to account the Maſſe a propitiatorie Sacrifice, for quicke & dead. ſo to beleene a mans ſelf to be purged from all his finnes by the blood of Chriſt, as to condemne Purgatory: not to beleene all ſuch doctrynes of the Councell of Trent, to*



\* Bulla Pii 4.  
super declarati-  
onem temporis  
&c.  
Gal. 1. 8.9.

bee of equall authority with the Scriptures, which notwithstanding haue no warrant in the Scripture, yea and to beleene and receiue them, non obstantibus, notwithstanding any Apostolicke \* constitution to the contrary: and the like. Now there is an Apostolicke constitution to the contrary: Si quis: If any man preach any other Gospell vnto you, then that yee haue receiued, let him bee accursed. Yet behold the Councell of Trent hath irrefragably decreed a new Gospell, consisting of the word written and vnwritten; but so, as all the saving doctrines (I say) all the saving doctrines, without the preaching and receiuing whereof, wee cannot ordinarily be saved, such as are expressly contained in the holy Scriptures, are made voyd, and accursed by Romes Traditions.

*Obiect.* But may not some predicant Frier, or so; by preaching, bee a meanes to saue a soule in that Church of Rome?

*Ans.* Not possibly, if he keepe him strictly, as hee is bound, to the Canon rule of the Councell of Trent. But say hee shall transgresse these rules, and so preach the Word of Salvation to the people, as that soules come thereby to bee saved. For example, say, hee shall preach vnto them, that they must beleene to bee saved by nothing, but the merits and righteousnesse of Christ imputed vnto them; that they must not looke to bee saved by their inherent righteousnesse, but by the only mercy of God towards them in Christ; that every one must haue a particular faith and affiance of his own, for the pardon of his sinnes; that they must worship God onely, and pray vnto him, and that in Christs name onely; that there is no sacrifice for sinne, but that of Christ, once offered vpon the crosse; that Christs blood doth so purge away sinne, as there remains no staine, nor punishment after this life: and the like. Indeepe if any Frier of them all dare preach thus, I deny not, but he may be an instrument of saving many soules: But in the meane time, doth hee not fall vnder the heavy curse of  
Trents

Trents Canons? Is not Inquisition presently made vpon him, as vpon an hereticke? Is hee not accursed with bell, booke, and candle? Is he not rewarded with fire and fagot? Or strangled in the dungeon of the Inquisition house? And for those people that haue drunke in those his saving doctrines to the comfort of their soules, are they not forced to recant, to doe penance, and what not? And if any one, or moe escape, and perievere in the saving faith so receiued; doe they not retire and conceale themselves? Dare they avouch this faith of theirs? How then can any conclude here, that because some haply may be saved in the Church of Rome, therefore the Church of Rome is a true visible Church of Christ? When on the contrary, the whole Church of Rome in the generall, and according to the Canons of Trent, disclaimeth all those doctrines, which are saving, and alloweth those onely, which can never saue; as wee haue sufficiently proved. But if any accidentally, or rather by some speciall providence, secret power, and unlimited mercy of God, shall come so to belecue, as thereby to be saved, is not he, and that his faith disavowed, and accursed of the Councell of Trent, as being not the faith of the Church of Rome, but accounted and accursed of her as hereticall?

Thus haue we seene (as M. Cholmeley hath desired) whether that be true, which I said.

But he addes: *It seemes he hath not beene beholden to any M. Cholmeley of those many cartloades of Homilies, Sermons, Postils, Meditations, the Mass and Eshivals, which are so diligently preached in the Church of Rome, and farre better, more soundly, and diligently, since that Councell, then before; to which many of the ordinary preachers are much beholden.*

*Reply.*

Alas, M. Cholmeley, you know me to be but a shallow fellow, but indeed my Living is so small, that I am not able to deale with cartloades, at least of Popish bookes. which coming



ming frō farre verifie the proverbe, *Farre sought, & deare bought*; what therefore I want in money to purchase, I am faine to supply in making choyce of a few of the best bookes. But what talke you of these Popish *Homilies*, &c. I will vndertake, that one Homily of the Church of England, hath more sound doctrine in it, then all your Homilies, Sermons, Postils, Meditations, Hiemals, and Estivals, put together. Nay, tell me, or show me in all your copious reading of such books, any one sound saving doctrine: tell me not of your morall Discourses. I will fetch as good out of *Plato, Cicero, Seneca, Horace*, and such like heathen Authors, as out of these their Schollars: And I am sure, that a Christian shall reape, if not more profit, yet prevent more perils by reading heathen Authors, then these Popish ones you commend. Is not poyson easily drunke in such golden cups? Or are such cups altogether free from some poysons? But you say, *they are farre better, more soundly and diligently preached since that Councell, then before; to which many of our ordinary preachers are much beholden*. Surely, M<sup>r</sup> *Cholmeley*, if your selfe were an ordinary Preacher, as your Portion of Clare giues you leaue to bee extraordinary, but once a moneth, I should thinke you were one of those that are, if not too much beholden to Popish Authors, whose language your pen doth so fluently drop. But I could wish, that our Preachers were lesse acquainted with Popish Authors, at least, such as are not thorowly seasoned with the antidote of sound doctrine and saving truth; then, I am perswaded, we should haue fewer *Neutralizers*, & such as speake the language partly of *Abdod*, and partly of *Canaan*. And to tell you my affection that way, truly I cannot but take it in high indignation, when I heare any Preacher alledging any Popish Author, as it were decking his sermon with the borrowed colours & feathers of vncleane birdes: nor would I euer haue (if I might chuse) any Protestant Preacher, that is not a leuer of the Church of Rome, to quote any Popish Author, *honoris gratia*,

*gratia*, (for wee haue farre more excellent of our owne) but only to beat them with their owne weapon, and to condemne them out of their owne mouth. But where you say, they are better since the Conncell of Trent then before, wee haue showed you before a sufficient difference for that, I hope, that wee neede not make any repetition.

‘But you adde: And I would they were not better taught there in some places, then ours are (*dolens dico*) in many Churches of England, Wales and Ireland.

*Reply.*

Surely you speake little for the credit of our Church. And I hope as vntruly. Nay let me tell you, if our meanest serued congregations haue no more, but a poore Curate to read Seruice, it is better means of saluation, then any they haue in the best congregations in the Church of Rome. This I speake not, to excuse the neglect of preaching: God forbid. And wo to them by whom the neglect comineth.

*Indeed (say you) they are taught to hate our Preachers, as M. Cholm. heretickes, and our preaching as heresy; and if hee say thereof, that they haue none at all, or hate all, he deceiues himselfe and others with his old fallacy, à Disto secundum quid &c.*

*Reply.*

Are they taught to hate the truth in vs, and do they loue it at all, trow you, any where? yea dare any of them preach that sauing truth, which we preach? Speake, M. Cholmley, giue vs one example: or perswade vs by some probable reason, how it may possibly be so, otherwise then I haue supposed. Till you show it, giue vs leaue to returne you your owne coyne, *you deceiue your selfe*, but I hope none else with you.

You conclude: *And if he say their preaching cannot breed true sauing faith, I pittie him: M. Cholmley, I haue said so much hereof already, as may suffice any reasonable man.*



M. Cholms.

Burton. pag. 67.

Reu. 18. Come out of her my people leaſt &amp;c.

Cholmley.

‘ Babylon doth not alwayes ſignifie the dominion and  
 ‘ Religion of the Beaſt: ſometimes it is taken *transiue*, for  
 ‘ the very citty, that is, the ſeat of his Dominion the Citty  
 ‘ of Rome, and ſo it is to bee vnderſtood. Reuel. 18. So that  
 ‘ all that can be concluded, is this: That God calleth his out  
 ‘ the Citty of Rome, when it is vpon the point of De-  
 ‘ ſtruction, that they may not bodily periſh with the wic-  
 ‘ ked.

Reply .

M. Cholmley muſt giue mee leaue to oppoſe againſt his  
 authority, the judgment of thoſe, whoſe learning and gra-  
 uity do every way outſtrip him. Firſt, M. John Fox, who  
 vnderſtands the fall of Babylon in a ſpirituall ſenſe to bee  
 principally meant of the Popiſh Religion. And *Quis tam*  
*talpa &c.* who is ſuch a mole (ſayth hee) as not to ſee this  
 already fulfilled? Another, *Flaccus Illyricus* vpon Reuel.  
 18. *Quod vero hic dicitur &c.* And that which is here ſaid  
 of the fall of that Babylon, ſeemeth rather to bee vnder-  
 ſtood, of the ſpirituall fall of it, or of the greatneſſe of er-  
 rours, whereby it hath falne from the trueth of doctrine  
 into horrible abominations, and from the fauour of God  
 into his wrath, then of any other temporary, or eternall  
 puniſhmēt. The Miniſters & Preachers of the Goſpel there-  
 fore diſcouering Antichriſt, & the errours of the Church, or  
 rather of the whore of Babylo, ſhall witneſſe that of Chriſts  
 Spouſe ſhe is become the ſtrūpet of Satan, of the ſeat of ſin-  
 cere Doctors, the chaire of peſtilēce; & of the Schoole of *Si-*  
*mon Peter* (who ſcarce euer was there) the Schoole of *Si-*  
*mon Magus*; of the Schoole of the Holy Ghoſt, the Schoole  
 and Lay ſtall of all impure ſpirits and beaſts: So hee. To  
 theſe I might adde the interpretation of *Alphonſus Con-*  
*radus*, of M. Perkins in his reformed Catholicke, of King  
 James in his noble Paraphraſe, and others of good note,  
 that

that expound the comming forth of Gods people out of Babylon to bee both *Spiritnall & Corporall*, according to Babylons fall in both kinds. And the text all along will beare the allegoricall and spirituall sence of Babylons fall very fitly. And M. *Cholmeley*s interpretation is too strait, for such a noble text: *for whereas the text saith, Come out of her my people, that ye be not partaker of her sins, & that ye receiue not of her plagues, he would restraine it only to the present time of her plagues; whereas the danger of partaking of her sins, both spirituall & morall is no lesse, if not more to be avoided, then of her plagues.* It was dangerous for *Lot* to linger out the time till the very point, when *Sodom* was to be destroyed. Let not M. *Cholmeley* then goe about to animate Gods people, to abide in Rome, till the very time of the ruine of it, out of a hope that God will be mercifull to them in the very nicke, or because it is impossible for Gods Elect to perish. It is safest to bee furthest from danger; and wee know not how soone or suddainely it may surprize vs, at least if we say peace when God warrants vs to beware. And K. *James* Papaphraaseth, that Gods people should hasten out of Babylon, to the end they may not onely escape the plagues of her sinnes, but also may be instruments to plague her.

*The second question; whether a simple Papist beleeneing and repenting, may be saued.*

M. *Cholmeley*. pag. 68.

*Reply.*

M. *Cholmeley* quarrels mee, for saying the state of the question is here altered. And is not my Tenent, that a Papist as a Papist, cannot be saued? But to beleue and repent, so as a man is saued, is not the property of a Papist, nor to be found in all the doctrine of the Church of Rome. But one thing which is necessarily included in my speech, viz. als, pag. 32. should haue beene better considered and vnderstood of M. *Cholmeley*, which I therefore here supply, 'to wit, that a Papist comming to beleue and repent to



saluation, this beliefe and repentance is not wrought in him by the ordinary doctrine of the Church of Rome, but either extraordinarily by Gods spirit, or otherwise, by meanes of hearing the word preached in the true Church, to wit, out of the Church of Rome. If M<sup>r</sup>. Cholmeley had obserued this well, he might haue spared many wast words and cavils, wherewith hee hath filled vp fīue or six pages, and all to no purpose, which I therefore passe ouer as ha- uing cleared the point sufficiently before.

M. Cholm-  
ley. pag. 72.

Onely of his acute distinction of a Papist *in sensu compo- sito, & diuiso*, a touch by the way. In the cōpound sense it signifieth an vnreformed Catholicke, that is, one that holds the same necessary heads of religion with the Pro- testant Churches; yet so, as hee retaines all errours in doctrine, whereby the said Religion is corrupted in the Church of Rome, ignorantly supposing them to bee the truth of God. In the diuided sense, it signifies, one that holds the errors of the Church of Rome without respect to the Orthodox truth maintained therein. Now to ap- ply this to our purpose: when wee say a Papist may bee saued, we vnderstand it in the former, & more large sense. And whē he saith, a papist cannot be saued, he vnderstands it in the latter, and more strict sense, and so wee are all agreed. This is the former point of his sophistry.

Qui statuit ali-  
quid parte in  
audita altera,  
nōsti qd seq.

Reply.

Stay; there goe more words to the bargain. Wee are all agreed say you, you should first aske my consent. But you must giue mee leaue not so suddainely to admit my Aduersary for arbitratour. I deny your distinction; I say, that every Papist doth either so hold the errours alone of the Church of Rome, as hee hath nothing to doe with the Orthodox truth, or so as by holding the errours, hee quite ouerturnes all sauing truth. For, tell mee M<sup>r</sup>. Cholmeley, lay but downe all the fundamentall errours of the Church of

of Rome, which euery Papist (take him in what sense you will, *Composito* or *disiiso*) must hold vnlesse hee will cease to bee a Papist: and canne hee possibly withall hold the contrary truthes? Do you not know that all saving truthes contained in Scripture must vaile bonnet, and suspend, while Romes Traditions bee serued and obserued? Admit of her Traditions, Decrees, Canons, and what becomes of your Orthodox trueth? Orthodox Sauiing truth shee hath none, as wee haue before proued. And so your example of the malefactor is impertinent.

Thus, whose the *Sophistry* is, iudge you.

His distinction of a twofold renouncing, pag. 73, one actuall, and expresse, another virtuall, and infolded, being as impertinent to the purpose as the former, I could wish M. *Cholmley* would bestow it somewhere else, that it may not fall to the ground. And I wish M<sup>r</sup> *Cholmley* had no need of it himselte, and that in no small measure. His friuolous and malicious cauils, to pag. 83, wee passe by, as more be- seeming the language of a Iesuite, then such as M. *Cholm- ley* should bee.

Pag. 83. Hee sets downe the comparison of the Maro- nean wine, and how I say, that Rome or Trent, hath made a dead vappa of the word of God. *Here, (hee sayth) his zeale transports him almost to blasphemy &c.* what blasphemy I pray you do you charge mee withall, M. *Cholmeley*? But it is well you qualifie it with, *Almost*. For otherwise you might with the Iewes haue laid flatte blasphemy to Christ himselte. For what say you to that speech of Christ (*Marth. 15.6*) *Thus haue ye made the Commandement of God of none effect by your Traditions*. I pray you M. *Cholmley*, if you canne find a good interpre- tation for your Masters speech, deny it not to your bro- ther, least malice transport you beyond the bounds of charity.



M. Cholm.

Pag. 86. So answerably, Rome must still bee a true visible Church, because the covenant betweene God and her still holdeth.

Reply.

M. Cholmeley hath talked much of the Covenant betweene God and the Church of Rome, as still in force. But hitherto he hath not brought one word to proue it.

Pag. 87. Hee quarrels mee, that I proue not in plaine termes, but onely Allegorically, the Couenant betweene God and the Church of Rome, to bee vtterly abrogated. What plaine termes doth M. Cholmley require? That I should proue, that Christ in person should come into the Popes consistory, and there in open Court disclaime the Church of Rome, saying, O Church of Rome, formerly my Spouse, but now, since thou hast giuen vp thy selfe to play the whore with another, since thou hast broken and denied thy faith with mee, I do from henceforth vtterly renounce thee for my wife: And the Church of Rome on the other side, should professe in open Court in expresse forme of words, saying, O Christ, once my husband, but now, seing thou art gone into a farre Countrey, I haue in thy absence made choice of another husband, to whom I adhere as my head, and therefore I will not from henceforth acknowledge any thy husbandly power ouer mee, further, then my earthly Husband and Head, the Pope shall allow? Or what would M. Cholmley haue.

But you proceede, pag. 88. 89. 90. there you prosecute the point of diuorce, betweene Christ and the Church of Rome. But first you say: If I were disposed to pick quarrels, I might haue excepted against many of your absurd phrases since I beganne to deale with you, and against one here, of a wifes Emancipating herselfe to another husband: But I aime at the maine point.

M. Cholm.

Reply.

It is well, that the maine point so carries you besides your  
your

your naturall *disposition to picke quarrels*. But as wee haue had prooffe of your criticisme in matter: so wee could bee content, to heare it in words, that wee might learne better to expresse our selues. But you change the phrase, and so offer violence a litle to the word. *Emanicipate*, which is, to captinate ones selfe to another, as well as to free, will I hope well agree with the Church of *Rome*, who (I say it againe, till you haue better corrected it) hauing with drawne her subiection from the law of Christs yoake, hath emancipated or subiected herselfe to the power of the Pope. And thus wee may take an estimate of the rest of thoe absurd phrases, which if you were *disposed*, you could *picke quarrels* with. But you *aim* at the *maine point*; wee joyne issue in that.

What is it then?

\* I make no doubt, but the Church of Rome hath long agoe (euen many hundred yeares before the Councell of *M. Cholm.* Trent) broken the covenant of her God; and still abideth in that transgression, and so deserueth well enough to bee divorced from Christ for euer: But that it was euer her desire to separate her selfe from Christ; it will neuer bee proued: nay it hath euer beene her cunning to make him a couer and cloake of all her whoredomes and abominations (as a subtile adulteresse dealeth with her long suffering and patient husband) that so shee may seeme to bee a *Matran*, though shee be indeed a notable strumpet: and this is the highest point of the mystery of iniquity.

*Reply.*

Heere is enough from *M. Cholmleyes* owne mouth, to confirme what wee haue said, although it is not his meaning to resigne up his opinion. It was *neuer her desire* (sayth he) *to separate her selfe from Christ*. How knowes *M. Cholm.* that? Is hee so intimously acquainted with Romes minde herein? But wee iudge men by their Deed and Act, not by their desire, as vnknowne to vs. Yea wee may iudge of



of the desire by the outward Act, specially being an Act of habit, deliberated & concluded vpon, & stiffly maintained. Can all this be without a desire? who forced her to such an Act? yea M. *Cholmley* confesseth in sume; that the Church of Rome, that strumpet, hath no other desire to be accounted Christs Spouse, but in hypocrisy, and craft, to make him a couer and cloake for her whoredomes and abominations: therefore shee pretends onely the name of Christs Spouse, whereas her desire is set wholly vpon another. And this is the very mystery of iniquity. This is the truest word M. *Cholmley* spake yet.

M. *Cholm.* But (sayth hee) *onely the Clergy hath made oath of obedience to the Bishop of Rome, and the profession of the Roman faith.*

*Reply.*

Why, M. *Cholmley*, is not the publicke Act of the Representitiue Church, the Act of the whole? And do you not by the representitiue, vnderstand the Clergy, as pag. 16. which you distinguish from the popular part? Besides, doth not the whole popular state of the Church of Rome, assent to the publicke act of the Councell of Trent, and to the priuate oath of every *Ecclesiasticall* person, for absolute obedience to the Pope, as their head and husband? Do not all Papists professe and auow this? Can you bring one Papist that denies it? I would wish you better consider of it at your further leasure.

But I am heartily sorry you should paralell our *oathes of Supremacy, Allegiance, and Canonickal obedience and our Subscription*, to the *oathes and subscriptions* of the Clergy of the Church of Rome, whereby they subiect themselves to the Pope as supreme Head of the Church, and to all the Decrees and Canons of that harlot Church. Do not you know that thereby they vnite themselves as members to Antichrist their head? Do we by our Oathes, or subscriptions ascribe the whole power of Christ, or submit the Scepter of his word, to the authority of man, to dispense as  
him

him pleaseth. I suppose if M. Chol. did but imagine so, he would make some scruple at least of swearing and subscribing. And surely if it be the selfesame reason for which the fanaticall Brownists and Anabaptists, as M. Cholmley saith, renounce society with vs : I would faine know of him, wherein they haue offended in so doing. Yea in so saying, M. Cholmley, you giue vs all cause to looke about vs, lest we fall into the same condemnation with the Church, or at least Cleargy of Rome in this case. But in the meane time (in my opinion) you haue giuen too much advantage to such separatists, you haue named, and left a most scandalous aspersiō vpon the state of our Cleargy and Church,

pag. 91. *That the Church of Rome was married to a second M. Cholm. husband in the Councell of Trent, & Christ excluded, or that these words, Come out of her my people, are a bill of Diuorce, or that Christ by them separateth his spouse from her, wee utterly deny.*

*Reply.*

Here you haue 3 branches. You haue done with the first, you say. But doe not you know, that the Councell of Trent pag. 92. hath so married the Church of Rome to the Pope, as Christ is necessarily and by consequence excluded? Tel me, whether is the Popes voyce, or Christs voyce of more authority with that Church. For the second, you appeale to *Brightman*, whom you are pleased to stile, my best Master, that [*come out of Babylon*] is meant of a local, not a spirituall separation. But good M. Cholmley doe not tyeme *Iurare in verba Magistri*. I haue answered this before.

To the third, we say, that seeing the wife is the whoore, and M. Cholm. the whoore is *Babylon*, Christ intendeth not heere to separate pag. 93. his wife or spouse from *Babylon*; because in so doing, shee should separate his wife from his wife, and *Babylon* from *Babylon*, which implyes a contradiction.



## Reply.

Good God! Christ expressly commandeth his people to come out of Babylon, &c. Yet doth he not intend here to separate his wife or spouse from Babylon? Take heed M. Cholmley, you be not past almost-blasphemy; much more past all blushing. For my part, I confesse, I cannot but blush to heare such babell, that I may not say, babelling language, frō a brother Minister: That then Christs people in Babylon are Babylon, and Babylon is Christs spouse, & Babylon and Christs spouse may not be separated, for they are both one, & *to goe about to separate them, implies a contradiction.* Judge good Reader, what stuffe here is. Babylon is the whore, how then is she Christs spouse, sith Christs spouse is a virgin? Can she be both a whore, and a virgin?

M. Cholm.

But it may bee these wordes are but an Introduction to his Authors words alledged, *ibid. to wit; As it is a visible Church, we haue not detrected to hold communion with it; as Babylon, we can haue nothing to doe with it.*

## Reply.

I perceiue he that holds of the Church of Rome, holdes a wolfe by the eares, which it is as difficult to let goe, as dangerous to hold. But M Cholmley, I will not any more deale with these words, as your Authors, but as yours, sith you haue assumed the whole quarrell vpon your selfe. I say then that a true visible Church of Christ, and Babylon, are ~~aduersary~~, they are no way compatible. A true visible Church cannot be Babylon, and Babylon cannot bee a true visible Church. Christ may haue his secret Church in Babylon, but this Church is not visible, as not daring openly to professe the faith of Christ; nor is this Church Babylon, nor of Babylon, but in Babylon. Now I proue that Babylon cannot be the visible Church of Christ, thus:

Babylon is Babylon, as it is Babylon:

But Babylon as it is Babylon is not the visible Church of Christ. Therefore Babylon is not the visible Church of Christ.

Till

Till M. Cholmley answere this Argument, let mee put him in minde of the sentence, which he hath ( of purpose, as it appeareth ) omitted in my answer: where, after these words, ' By what distinction? (I pray you) can an honest and chaste ' matron salve her credit, by keeping company, or hauing ' communion with a notorious strumpet? *he hath left off the ' inference following*, will she say, As shee is a woman, a creature of the same flesh and blood, as being the Image of ' God, I detrect not to hold cōmunion with her? *Or I might ' haue said thus*, Such a woman is wife to an honest man, ' but she playes the notorious strumpet with another: wel, ' as shee is such a mans wife, I detrect not to hold communion with her: but as she is a filthie strumpet, I may haue ' nothing to doe with her. M Cholmley might as well argue thus: *As the Church of Rome is the whore of Babylon, we haue nothing to doe with her; but as she is a virgin, Christs spouse, we detrect not to hold communion with her.* This Distinction will proue good, whenever M Cholmley can proue, that one & the same woman may be at the same time, both a whore, and a chaste virgin, in a different respect. Againe, in such a flat contradiction, he should doe well to resolue vs, which of these to preferre, & which to exclude, whether wee should detrect altogether to holde communion with her, as a whoore; or we should hold communion with her, as she is a spouse. As also, how wee may with keeping both our credit, and good conscience, both communicate with her as a spouse, & not communicate with her as a whore. But enough (I feare) of these contradictions, & solecismes, or bad coherences.

Pag. 95. That the Reformed Churches neuer made a full and totall separation from the Church of Rome, but only partiall, from her corruptions; Jewell saith, *Non tam ab ea, quam ab eius erroribus discessimus.* M. Cholm.

Reply.

Jewell saith not, *Non ab eā*. but *Non tam ab ea*, He speaks comparatiuely, not<sup>o</sup> positiuely: Not so much from her,



*Jewels Apology*  
cap. 9. sect. 3.

Sect. 1.

[ Sect. 2.

as from her corruptions and errours. Hee saith not, Wee haue not departed from her. But what saith the same *Jewell* a little before. They seeke to choke vs, saith he, with the bare name of the Church. *And againe, ibidem.* These men now, after they haue le't nothing remaining in the Church of God, that hath any likenesse of his Church, yet will they seeme the Patrons, and the valiant maintainers of the Church. *And cap. 10.* These mens parts had beene, first to haue truely and clearely proued, that the Romish Church is the true and right instructed Church of God. *And ibid.* For our parts if we could haue judged Ignorance, Error, Superstition, Idolatry, Mens Inventions, & the same commonly disagreeing with the holy Scriptures, either to please God, or to bee sufficient for obtaining of euerlasting saluation; Or if we could ascertain our selues, that the Word of God was written but for a time only, and after a time againe ought to bee abrogated, and put away: or els, that the sayings and commaundments of God ought to be subject to Mans wil, that whatsoever God sayth and comandeth, except the Bishop of Rome will, and commaund the same, it must bee taken as voyde and vnspoken: if we could haue brought our selues to beleue these things; wee grant, there had beene no cause at all, why we should haue left these mens company. So our *Jewell*.

*M. Cholm.*

You adde to *Jewels Apologie*, *M. Perkins* reformed Catholicke, *Wherein hee shoves in euery head of doctrine, how farre wee may and must holde communion with that Church.* So you.

*Reply.*

But I would *M. Cholm.* would marke what the same *M Perkins* in his Epistle Dedicatory to that treatise, sayth: It is a notable policy of the Deuill (sayth he) which hee hath put into the hearts of sundry men in this age, to think

that

'that our Religion, and the Religion of the present Church  
 'of Rome, are all one for substance: and that they may bee  
 'reunited, as (in their opinion) they were before. But  
 'let men in shew of moderation, pretend the peace and  
 'good estate of the Catholicke Church, as long as they  
 'will: this vnion of the two Religions can neuer bee made,  
 'more then the vnion of light and darknesse. And this  
 'shall appeare, if we doe but a little consider, how they of  
 'the Romane Church haue razed the Foundation. And a  
 'little after: It should be a great height of vnthankfulnes  
 'in vs, not to stand out against the present Church of  
 'Rome, but to yeeld our selues to plots of reconciliation.  
 So he. And in his preface: The first reason in his Dis-  
 'course is, To confute all such Politickes, as hold and main-  
 'taine that our Religion, and that of the Roman Church,  
 'differ not in substance, and consequently, that they may be  
 'reconciled. Doth the Church of Rome raze the Founda-  
 'tion? Then what communion with her? yea in that Trea-  
 'tise vpon these words, *Goe out of her my people*, hee makes  
 'this obseruation: That all those who wilbe saued, must  
 depart and separate themselves from the faith and religion  
 of this present Church of Rome. How then will this agree  
 with M. Cholmley, Wee must hold communion with that  
 Church? Yes, *Est quoddam prodire tenuis*, so farre we may  
 and must hold communion with that Church. How farre,  
 and wherein M. Cholmley? In the points set downe in the  
 Reformed Catholicke, so farre. But doe not you know,  
 that they say one thing in the generall, and quite ouer-  
 throw it in their particular conclusions? They holde the  
 Scriptures in generall, but ouerthrow them in particu-  
 lar, namely by their Traditions, and the Papall Oracles:  
 thus I might instance in all other fundamentall doctrines,  
 which are mentioned by the councell of Trent; so that  
 when they haue summed vp all, they haue not one  
 true intire sauing doctrine left, Name one, if  
 you canne, Master Cholmley, I say, one intire  
 sauing



sauing doctrine, which they haue not directly ouerthrowne, either expressely, or by necessary consequence if you cannot, take your Calumniator away with you. For the sauing truth, which we hold, is not Romes sauing truth, they haue nothing to doe with it, they haue denyed, abjured, accursed it, as we haue shewed. Wherein therefore can either you, or any Author of yours, show our communion with the Church of Rome (I meane for sauing truth) but it must be with her deceivable errors, & doctrines of Devils? Or what communion can you haue with the Church of Rome, but in some of her Additionalls, wherewith shee vndermineth the Fundamentall Truths? Till you can show it to be otherwise, better then yet you haue done, bee not so prodigall of your reproachfull language, which you continue pag. 97, and all along.

*M. Cholm.*

Pag. 99. *M. Cholmley* saith. *Some men are nettles, which if a man handle softly, they sting him: but if hardly and roughly, they are not felt.* Hereby hee insinuates with his reuerend Author, to deale with me accordingly. But I tell you *M. Cholmley*, take heed, lest while you thinke to crush a nettle, you finde it a thorne, which the more it is crushed, the deeper it pierceth. And truth is, a Lillie among thornes, against which you will finde it hard kicking.

Pag. 100. hee addes: *The Reuerend Author must vse them like hounds, which the more a man beateth, the better they loue him; or like the Wilde Irish, which are most seruiceable, when they are most flauishly vsed.* You mistake the matter a little. I am neither of the hound nor Spaniel kinde, dogges of game. And you know how incanonical it were for such Reuerend Authours to meddle with such dogges. Nor haue I at any time *M. Cholm.* like those dogges, licked vp my Masters spittle, were he neuer so Reuerend, in hope of some fat moriell from his fuller dish. I am indeed a poore dogge of the flocke, or if you will, a Mastife, to watch my Masters house: If wolues or theeues approach,

approach, I may perhaps barke; but if they presse mee, and I bite them, blame mee not, I doe but my kinde, to defend my Masters trust. And that you compare me to the Wilde Irish, as most *seruiceable*, whē most *slauishlie vſed*: you may know M. *Cholm*. I was neuer ſlaue to any man, much leſſe as for any mans cauſe to be ſeruiceable vnto Antichriſt againſt Chriſt; to the whore of Babylon, againſt the Mother Church of *England*. The wilde Irish indeed are a generation of Satyrs, fit to daunce after your Satyricall pipe, M. *Cholm*: they cannot but like your defence of their Romiſh mother, they could well enough brooke ſuch Preachers among them. But God bee thanked they are packt home againe, that vpon no termes, they can bee ſo ſeruiceable for Romes faction.

Pag, 101. M. *Cholm*. ſets downe my wordes: *Is outward profeſſion a ſufficient marke of viſibilitie for a Church? This is none of thoſe markes, which the Church of England takes notice of a Church by.*

*Cholmley.*

‘No? Are they not the preaching of the Word, Adminiſtration of Sacraments, & Eccleſiaſticall Diſcipline? And what outward profeſſion of Chriſtianity can any viſible Church make without theſe? Outward profeſſion therefore comprehendeth them all, and ſo is a ſufficient marke of the viſibility for a Church.

*Reply.*

M. *Chol*. your raving language in the former page, promiſed ſome rousing matter in this. For what can bee more ſenſleſſe, then to inferre, that where there is outward profeſſion, there muſt bee the true markes of a viſible Church? The Church of Rome profeſſeth to bee the true Church, yea the onely Catholick Church, & to haue all the marks; but therefore hath ſhe them? therefore is ſhee ſuch as ſhee profeſſeth? yea the Church of *England* denyes the Church

of



of Rome the true markes of a visible Church; but you will proue the contrary by their outward profession. But how you haue proued this, we haue shewed before.

Pag. 102. The Samaritans profession of the Iewish religion you disproue, as being neuer in the covenant, but Aliants from the common-wealth of Israel. I doe not bring that instance, to proue that they were in the couenant: but that they had outward profession of a Church. Had they not Iewish Priests sent among them, of whom they were circumcised without the signe of Gods covenant, and of whom they learned the manner of the Iewish religion. But

† Faciunt fa-  
uos & velp:  
faciunt Ecclesi-  
as & Marcioni-  
tz. Tertulad-  
vers. Marcion.  
lib. 4.

by this you see, that the † outward profession is not sufficient to make or demonstrate a true Church. And doe not you holde, that a particular Church may so fall from her covenant with God, by destroying the very foundation of faith and religion, as if she had neuer been in the covenant, and shee may retaine an outward profession still? Is shee therefore a true Church? What say you of the Arrian Churches, who yet retained some outward markes, they had the Scriptures, the Creed, the Sacraments, but not purely according to Christ? Were they therefore true Churches. \* D. Whitakers saith, It is one thing to challenge, another to challenge lawfully, and by right. So Papists (saith he) doe challenge the lawfull vse of the Lords Supper: haue they it therefore?

\* Aliud est quod  
vendicetur. Ali-  
ud quo iure. A-  
liud est vendi-  
care: aliud iure  
& legitime  
vendicare Whi-  
taker de Eccle-  
sia contro. 2.

Qu: 5. sic Pa-  
pistæ vendicant  
legittimum v-  
sum Cænz. &c.

Pag. 103, 104. M. Cholmley quarrels my not much stand-  
ding with the Church of Rome for the bare name of a  
Church, &c. saying pag. 104.

*You are verie libellous of that which is none of your owne:  
Can you be content to afford the precious name of a Christian  
and of a Church to them, which in mans judgement, not par-  
tially affected, are not so? The Iewes would neuer doe it, neither  
will the Papists doe it, neither will the reformed Churches  
doe it, neither will any well informed Christian doe it. But you  
will not much stand ypon it.*

Reply.

*Reply.*

First, you seeme to strike at my Name, wherein it will haply appeare, you are more prodigall of that which is your owne, I meane a malicious tongue, then I liberall, as of a thing not mine owne: for that which I stand not vpon much with the church of Rome, & the members thereof, about the bare Name of a Church, and of Christians. And will not you allow your brother the bare name of a Christian. The name of a Church indeed is none of his own. But you turne *Bare name* into a *Precious name*. This I stand vpon, not to belong to the Church of Rome at all. There is great oddes betweene a bare name, & a precious name. Or haue you any speciall quarrell to my precious name, that you thus bring it in by head and shoulders? Indeede no mans name is in his owne power, but in others. And it must needs fare ill even with the best name, when it comes to bee tossed vpon the pikes of serpentine tongues. Our Name is no lesse tender, then our eye, but more incurable, when hurt. A mote in the eye, the tongue of a friend gently lickes out: but the least mote on our name, is by the tongue of fame made a beame. If my name haue suffred here, whether through mine owne folly, or others malice: yet my comfort is, it is written, there, where neither the inbred moth of sinfull nature, nor the backebiting theefe commeth. And I assure you, M *Cholmeley*, I can with farre greater patience heare and beare all your reprochings, then I can beare with my selfe, for the least offence to God, or men. How can you justly fasten any reproach vpon me, as I stand both in Gods court, and of mine owne conscience, though I abhorre my selfe. And if ought but good haue befallen my name, I am more beholdē to your malice for telling me, then to any mans loue. Nor was I ignorant, when I first entred the lists of these controversies, but that I should thereby exasperate malevolent  
L                      tongues



tongues and spirits against me. But I passe not for all, so I may glorify God, though I be nothing. And I know it is not for nothing, that hee hath thus humbled mee to the very dust. Howsoever hee dealeth with mee, I haue still cause to blesse his name.

But to allow the bare name of a Church to that of Rome, do ye reprove it in mee, when yee sticke not to force vpon it, not only the *name*, but the very essence of a true visible Church of Christ? This the Church of England doth not, this the reformed Churches doe not, this the learnedst Divines of our Church haue not done: yet may wee not suffer them to glory in the bare name of a Church, the very name of a Church being the first Note of *Bellarmines* 15, to know the Church of Rome by? The true name of a Jew is *precious*, as *Rom. 2. 29.* yet wee deny them not the bare name at this day. Thus wee call Papists Christians, but we do not meane true Christians. Thus we say, *The Church of Rome*, but we doe not meane it is a true Church of Christ. Yea your selfe confesseth, that in mans judgment not partially affected, the precious name of a Church belongeth not to the Church of Rome: why then are you so partially affected, as to defend it for a true Church, and yet so farre to forget your selfe, as to quarrell with me, for not much standing with it for the bare name?

His repetitions (*pag. 105. 106.*) we having before fully answered wee passe by: Onely I cannot balke his wordes, *pag. 106. Yet if they haue the shell, that is, the outward profession of their foundation directly, it is enough to make them be said to hold the foundation directly.* So M<sup>r</sup> *Cholmeley*. It is enough to M<sup>r</sup> *Cholmeley*, to proue the Church of Rome to hold the foundation directly, if they may be but said to hold the foundation directly; though all their hold they may put in a nut-shell. I cannot better compare M<sup>r</sup> *Cholmeleyes* maintayning the Church of Romes holding the foundation directly, then to the man in *Plutarch*, in holding his shuppe, who when one hand was cut off by the enemy, held

held fast by the other, and when that was cut off too, got hold with his teeth. Thus M *Cholmeley* goes on tooth and naile to keepe his Tenet, his *hold*. For to proccede, pag. 107. hee stiffely denies, that the Church of Rome, or the Councell of Trent, doth directly deny this foundation, to wit, the righteousnesse of Christ, imputed to vs for our Iustification. But I proue it, alledging the councell of Trent. Sess. 6. Can. 10. *Si quis dixerit homines per ipsam Christi iustitiam formaliter iustos esse, Anathema sit.* If any shall say, that men are formally just by the very righteousnesse of Christ, let him be accursed.

Now let vs heare M *Cholmeleyes* expresse answer.

'Is this an expresse, flat, and direct deniall of the foundation? then *Melanchton, Calvin, Illyricus*. and all sound and good Protestants, doe expressely, flatly, and directly deny the foundation: for all of them doe, and must hold this doctrine for accursed: and all the Ministers of the Church of England haue cause to bee ashamed of your ignorance and boldnesse. M. Cholmley

'(M *Burton*) who dare challenge the Church of Rome to deny the foundation directly, in that wherein shee holdeth and confirmeth the trueth of the Gospell. You must know therefore, that in these wordes is condemned the damnable doctrine of *Andrew Osiander* and his followers, who taught and held, that a man is formally justified by the very righteousnesse by which Christ himselfe is essentially just and righteous, being partakers thereof by inhabitation. This allegation therefore, is a notable abuse, not onely of the councell, but of your ielfe, & the Reader. See *Bellarmino de Iustif. lib. 2. cap. 2. His verbis*: though himselfe offend therein also afterwards.

*Reply.*

To the end it may appeare which of vs [M *Burton*, or you M *Cholmeley*] all the Ministers of the Church of England, haue cause to be ashamed of for ignorance and boldnesse: it is requisite, that we doe more fully declare the minde,

L 2

purpose,



purpose, and scope of the councell of Trent in the forecited place, *Sess. 6. canon. 10.* As also, what was the opinion of *Andrew Osiander*. Which when we haue done, I referre all to the judgement of all the *Ministers of the Church of England.*

First, for *Osianders* opinion, wee finde it set downe by *Calvin, Instit. lib. 3. cap. 11. sect. 8. Hoc Osiandri placitum est, quum Deus & Homo sit Christus, respectu diuinae naturae, non humane factum nobis esse iustitiam*: It is the invention of *Osiander*, whereas Christ is both God and Man, that in respect of his Diuine Nature, and not his humane, hee is made vnto vs righteousnesse. And *Sect. 9. Iustitiam Dei inflatis buccis attollit Osiander, & triumpham canit, quasi euicerit esse spectrum illud suum essentialis iustitiae*. *Osiander* doth with blowne-up cheekes advance the righteousnesse of God; and soundes the triumph, as if hee had euinced it to bee that phantasie of his, of essentiall righteousnesse. Or as *Buchanus* sets it downe: *Osianders* opinion was (saith hee) that men were made just, by the essentiall righteousnesse of God, that is, the righteousnesse, vvhich is the very Diuine Essence.

*Buchanus de  
justif. error  
Osiandri.*

In the next place, let vs see, vvhhat is the maine scope of the councell of Trent, in determining the formall cause of justification. This is set downe, not in ambiguous, but cleare tearmes in the *6. Session, cap. 7*: to vvhich the canon by mee alledged, hath speciall reference, as vvee may see in the margent ouer against the tenth canon, vvhich is put, *supra cap. 7*. Now the summe of the councell in the *7. chapter*, about the formall cause of justification, is to exclude the righteousnesse of Christ imputed to vs as the *formall cause of our iustification*, and to admit no other formall cause, but *inherent righteousnesse* in vs. The wordes

vvordes of the counsell are: *Dennum unica formalis causa est iustitia Dei: non quia ipse iustus est, sed quia nos iustos facit: qua videlicet ab eo donati, renouamur spiritu mentis nostre, & non modo reputamur, sed verè iusti nominamur & sumus, iustitiam in nobis recipientes, unusquisque suam secundam mensuam, quam Spiritus Sanctus partitur singulis prout vult, & secundum propriam cuiusque dispositionem & cooperationem.* Quamquam enim nemo possit esse iustus, nisi cui merita passionis Domini nostri Iesu Christi communicantur: id tamen in hac impia iustificatione fit, dum eiusdem sanctissima Passionis merito per Spiritum sanctum, charitas Dei effunditur in cordibus eorum, qui iustificantur, &c.

But (saith M. Cholmeley) you must know, that in these wordes (to wit Canon 10.) is condemned the damnable doctrine of *Osiander*. What? of *Osiander* onely? Or mainly? How proues hee that? See *Bellarmino*. *Bellarmino* indeede saith, that by *Iustitia Dei, qua ipse iustus est* (as chapter 7.) is rejected the opinion of *Osiander*. What then? was it therefore the maine scope of the counsell, there to meete vvith the opinion of *Osiander*? No, *Bellarmino* vpon that 7. chap. Sess. 6. shoues, how the counsell rejects other opinions and errours besides, as imputatiue righteousness for one; Iustification by faith onely; a twofold righteousness, imputatiue, and inherent, iudiciary justification by remission of sinnes. And indeede howsoeuer this imputatiue righteousness bee shuffled among those fve opinions, and errours mentioned: yet this is the maine ayimed at. Yea *Bellarmino* in the very next section, summes vp the vvhole state of the question of formall justification, set downe, cap. 7. Sess. 6. thus: *Porro status est, &c.* Moreover the state of the whole controuersy may be reduced to this simple

L 3

question;



Andr. Vega lib.  
7. de causis Iu-  
stit. c. 22. quod  
Christi iustitia  
neque sit, neq;  
possit esse cau-  
sa nostræ Iu-  
stificationis.

question, whether the formall cause of absolute iustification, bee inherent righteousness in vs, or not. Againe, in the 10 Canon by mee alledged, the councell speakes not of the righteousness of God, simply, but of Christ onely: But *Osianders* opinion was of the righteousness of God, not of Christ, God & Man. So that this Canon being referred in the margent to the 7 chapter, it expoundes the righteousness of God there, to be meant of the righteousness of Christ. *A. Vega* also commenting vpon the same point of formall iustification, taking the councels wordes alledged for his text, makes this to be the summe. *Non iustificari, &c.* We will plainly teach, that sinners are not justified by the righteousness of Christ, as by the formall cause of their justification, and that the righteousness of Christ neither in it selfe, neither as communicated vnto vs, and after it's manner made ours, is the formall cause of our justification. And a little lower he saith, "That inherent righteousness were superfluous, if so bee wee were just formally by the righteousness of Christ, as they of *Colen* thinke. Therefore sole righteousness inherent shall suffice to make men just, and it is altogether superfluous, and abhorring from all Philosophie, for this to put any righteousness, to wit, the imputatiue righteousness of Christ. So *Vega*. Nay, so all Pontifician writers. See *Chemnitius* his *Examen de Iustificatione*. Is the case then of the councell of Trents ouerthrowing the maine foundation of justification in the onely formall cause thereof, Christs righteousness imputed, vpon due triall, so cleare? How comes then M *Cholmeley* to be thus egregiously deceived: surely I know not, vnlesse *Chemnitius* render the reason, *Ipsam verò artificium, &c.* But the artifice, whereby the Architects, or master-builders of these Decrees haue so involved & wrapped the thing it selfe vnder some show, least it should by & by of the vnskillfull be smelled out, is worthy of observation. But can we impute ignorance, or vnskillfulness to M *Cholmeley*? Perhaps it is but an  
overweaning

overweaning opiniõ of his wit, that he may say what hee will, supposing that such an ignorant & shallow fellow as M. *Burton*, is not able to say Boh to a goose. Shall I say, it is not any propensity of affection to defend Popery, farther then to vnderprop the party, or part he hath undertaken to defend. Whatsoever it is, that I leave in *media*, to the judgement of all the Ministers of the church of England to decide as I said before.

But after all this stirre, say, I had alledged one place, then which I might haue alledged another more proper and perspicuous. M. *Cholmeley* knew, that the ground of my allegation, was to proue, that the councell of Trent overthrew the foundation, by denying justification by the imputation of Christs righteousness. Doth M. *Cholmeley* defend the church of Rome herein? yes surely: for let vs come to another canon of Trent, wherein M. *Cholmeley*, with no lesse felicity, cleares them from ouerthrowing the foundation of justification.

Pag. 108. hee set downe my wordes: "And in the 11<sup>th</sup> canon, if any man shall say, that men are justified, either by the sole imputation of Christs righteousness, or by sole remission of sins, (otherwise then by inherent righteousness in vs obtayned thereby) or also that the grace of God, whereby wee are justified, is onely the fayour of God: let him be accursed. What more direct deniall of the foundation?"

To which M. *Cholmeley* answereth, pag. 109. "I might here challenge you for altering and changing the wordes of the councell, but I will not take all advantages: I answer therefore, that it seemes you know not the true meaning of the councell; or taking the word Iustification in the councels owne sense; this canon containes very sound and christian doctrine. What then doth it meane by Iustification? A compound of Protestant Iustification, and Sanctification; for so it defines Iustification: cap. 7. of this Session in the first wordes: *Iustificatio est non sola*



*sola peccatorum remissio, sed & sanctificatio & renovatio interioris hominis per voluntariam susceptionem gratia & donorum:* and so the sense and meaning of the canon is this: If any man shall say, that men are so justified by the sole imputation of Christs righteousness, or by sole remission of sinnes, that they are also sanctified thereby, without inherent grace and charity: or also, that the grace, whereby we are so justified, is only the favour of God; let him bee accursed. And let him be indeede so for me. You will say, this is nothing but meere juggling, I grant it: but it is not direct deniall of the foundation: For here (as *Chemnitius* acknowledgeth) is both remission of sinnes, and imputation of Christs righteousness included; which, though it be sufficient to justification in the Protestant sense, yet in the Popish sense (wherein sanctification is required) it is not sufficient.

*Reply.*

Your moderation (*M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeley*) in taking all advantages, I cannot but admire. But (I confesse) I cannot so easily forbear your altering and changing of the Councils sense, as you say I have done the wordes. Although you have added something to my wordes, and to the councils text. But I passe it by. First I will make good mine owne (although I have but expressed the councils sense more clearly, by the 7<sup>th</sup> chapter, (as I have noted in the margent.)) The Canon intire is thus. *If any shall say, that men are justified, either by sole imputation of Christs righteousness, or by sole remission of sinnes, excluding grace and charity, which is diffused in their hearts by the Holy Ghost, and is inherent in them: or also, that the grace, whereby we are justified, is onely the favour of God: let him bee accursed.* Now (*M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeley*) you grant, that this is nothing, but meere juggling: Is it so? How then can you say (without juggling) that this Canon containes very sound and christian

christian doctrine taking the word justification in the counsell's owne sense? you take it for a compound of Protestant justification, and sanctification. And is this I pray you very sound and christian doctrine? yes, as you state the sense of the canon, the true sense whereof you say is this, If any man shall say, that men are so justified by the  
 'the sole imputation of Christs righteousness, or by sole  
 'remission of sinnes, that they are also sanctified thereby  
 'without inherent grace and charity: or also, that the grace  
 'whereby wee are so iustified, is onely the fauour of God,  
 'let him be accursed: and let him so bee indeed, for mee, say you; yea? will you say Amen to Trents Anathema? will you accurse him that shall say, *The grace whereby wee are justified is onely the fauour of God?* Will not you say so? otherwise you lye vnder the Anathema of the Apostles canon. Gal. 1. 8. *If any man, yea or an Angell from heauen preach any other Gospell vnto you then that wee haue preached vnto you, let him be accursed.* Read Gal. 2. 20. *Who loued mee, and gaue himselfe for mee. Is not the onely loue and fauour of God in Christ the grace whereby wee come to bee justified?* And Rom. 5. 16. *The free gift is of many offences vnto justification.* And Rom. 3. 24. *Being iustified freely by his grace &c.*

But it may be you meant your curse respectiue to the former part of your canon. But according to your gloss, how do ye thinke the Pope & his conclaue the great propugners and vindicators of Trents canons, will take this interpretation of yours? Do you goe about to make the canon speake nothing, but very sound and christian doctrine: and do you thinke to escape their Anathema? Doe not you confesse it meere juggling? And do you thinke in good earnest all this while, that so many choice wits assembled in that church, spending no lesse then 7 monethes in this one sixt Session, beating their busie and actiue braines, how they might with most artifice weaue such a webbe, such a mystery of iniquity, as therewith to intangle the Flyes: that their vps hott was to decree indeed,



sound and Christian Doctrines? M<sup>r</sup> *Cholmley*, do not deceive vs, by making vs beleue yee are so simple. But on the other side, you say, that justification taken in the Councils owne sence, is nothing else but *a compound of Protestant Justification and sanctification*. How doth this agree with your Canon, as you haue set it downe? There you distinguish plainly betweene justification and sanctification: how then do ye make a compound of them? And you may know, that in this case, the very composition and mixture quite marres and alters the property of such simple. For if justification and sanctification bee compounded, to make vp one justification, as a purgation for sinne, your justification proues altogether vneffectuall. Nor can I see how these two can possibly bee compounded, I meane the Protestants justification and sanctification, to make vp the Popish justification, each of the Simples retaining their properties. For the protestant justification is the Imputation of Christs righteousness, no infused, or inherent. Againe Protestant Sanctification is no part of our justification in Gods sight. So that compounding justification with sanctification, it is by the Councell of Trents Alchymistry all turned into sanctification at the best, though indeed it be neither justification, nor sanctification, but haue the name of justification. For the Councell of Trent, and all Potifician writers vpon it, allow but one kind of justification and that is inherent, they wholly exclude justification by imputation, taken in the Protestants sence. Wherevpon *Andreas Vega*, Trents interpreter, disaproueth the double justification of the Prouince of Colon, one, by the imputation of Christs righteousness by faith: the other: Renovation of the inner man. Wherefore *Vega* saith, *Quare cum ipsi non negent, &c.* Wherefore, sith themselves do not deny inherēt righteousness, they ought even by this argument to haue beene moued, not to beleue, that any man is justified by the righteousness of Christ, as by the formall cause. So hee. Thus wee see what a confu-

Andreas Vega  
lib. 7. de causis  
Iustif. cap. 22.

on M<sup>r</sup> *Cholmeley* hath brought his *Compound* of *Protestant justification* and *sanctification* vnto: whereof while he would make one medicine to rectifie the Canon of Trent, and to make it, vtter against the will, *very sound and Christian doctrine*: hee is like to runne such a hazzard, as *Pauls* vessell, which runne aground, and was wracked betweene two seas. Againe, I cannot but admire, that any so well growne Minister in the Church of England should bewray such ignorance in so maine a doctrine, as justification; as to approue of that for very sound and christian doctrine, which (at the best) joyneth inherent righteousness as a necessary part at least to make vp justification? Although indeed the Papists allow of no other justification but that which is inherent. But take them in the best sense, as M<sup>r</sup> *Cholmeley*, the compound sense; to compound *Protestant justification with sanctification*, doth it not wholly ouerthrow justification by Christ? Read *Gal. 5. 2. 4.* See also Truths triumph ouer Trent.

Yet, for all this hee goes on, persists in his opinion, and sayth pag. 111. that although Gods people must come out of Babylon, yet not vpon that ground, that the Councell of Trent doth directly deny and ouerthrow the foundation. And so (sayth hee) I conclude, as I beganne, Apply *Iohn Barber* and thou shalt haue a new pare of sissers.

*Reply.*

Now it is pittie, that in the vpsshot of all, you haue no more variety of inuention, sith your tongue all along hath not failed to cut like a sharpe razor. But I suppose that since the other time that you were trimmed with *Iohn Barbers* sissers, the lockes of your malicicioussnesse are growne so long againe, that they will need a new paire of sissers. Or seeing, you with your brother *Butterfield* haue pleaded so well for *Beldame Babell*, and her shaueling sons, if you purpose to bee of that Order and fraternity, you may doe well to change your two paire of sissers, for two Razors,



to serue each of your turnes. For I finde not in either of your bookes any thing, but *lippis dignum & conforibm.* But stay a little, and so cut of all together.

For he adds in his concluding leafe.

M. Cholm. 'Pag. 113.. It is well obserued, that this fellow hath a  
' notable dexterity in dedicating Epistles before his  
' bookes, and in Prefaces, digressions, Epilogues, and the  
' like, but that in his Tracts, Discourses, and disputations,  
' he is as hungry and dry, as Famine it selfe. This, as it is  
' true in all his writing, so especially in this, as I hope I  
' haue in good measure made it appeare by the Premisses  
' &c.

### Reply.

This fellow? which fellow? your Aduersary M. Burton do you meane? Is it not hee to whom in your Epistle to mee, you were every way *equall*? *Iam sumus ergo pares.* Onely I will not *par pari referre*. Methinkes I should not say, to a minister, and my equall, so contemptuously, *This fellow.* Or how growes the difference betweene vs? Because you haue a rich Benefice, and I a poore? Or because you plead for the Church of Antichrist, and I of Christ? Or because you defend a mans cause, and I Gods? Or because you haue pleaded a bad cause so well, and I a good, so ill? Well, what say you of this fellow? *It is well obserued.* By whom? But what? you seeme to compare all my poore workes to a proud Pharisee, or hypocrite, all faire without, but within a few dry-bones or dust, *hungry and dry, as famine it selfe.* Surely then in one thing you haue mette with mee: for though your Epilogue bee bitter, yet your Prologue, your Epistle to mee seemed to promise some ingenuity and Candor: but loe through the whole body of your Discourse, you feed my hunger and thirst with nothing but

but gall and vinegar. Do you thus fulfill that of the Apostle, *If thine enemy hunger feed him, if hee bee dry giue him drinke?* What? with gall and vinegar? But otherwise you cannot *heape hote coales vpon his head.* Well But are all my bookes in the bulke, *so hungry and dry?* How proue you that? *This (say you) as it is true in all his writings, so especially in this.* Why, M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeley, do you find in any of my writings any vnfound doctrines, or rotten stufte, such as yours is full stuffed, yea stifled withall? But is this *especially* so? what if not so? But you hope you haue in good measure made it appeare by the Premisses. But whereon is your hope grounded? vpon appearances? you know you must passe the Censure of the iudicious Reader, to whose vnpartiall iudgement you haue appealed. And belecue it, they will not take appearances for substances. And to them I appeale too. Now what if this booke of myne proue not so hungry and dry, but full of such strong meate, as M. Cholmeleys stomacke is not able to digest? Will hee therefore cast it in my dish? Now all yee Reuerend and Learned Fathers and Brethren, Fellow-labourers in this noble vineyard iudge indifferently what in this waighy cause, hath beene, how slenderly soeuer, sayd on truths behalfe, and the LORD giue you vnderstanding in all things. What hath beene defectiue on my part, I humbly craue pardon for, and remitte the rest to be perfected by some stronger Champion. Yet before I part with M. Cholmeley, let mee bestow a few Syllogisimes vpon him, least hee should altogether triumph for default of Logicke. I doubt I shall giue him more then hee can tell what to doe withall.

I will therefore sume vp what I haue manifestly proued against M. Cholmeley in this my Reply into formes Syllo-



gistical, adding withall sundry other Arguments, all concluding the Church of Rome to be no true visible Church of Christ.

The first Argument from the definition of a true visible Church of Christ.

*Proposition.* The true visible Church of Christ, is a congregation of faithfull men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments bee duly administred according to Christs Ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

*Assumption.* But the Church of Rome is not a congregation of faithfull men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments duly administred, according to Christs Ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

*Conclusion.* Therefore the Church of Rome is not a true visible Church of Christ.

The Proposition is the Church of Englands, Article 19.

The assumption also is proved by the second Sermon for Whit-sunday, where the preaching of the pure word of God, and the due administrations of the Sacraments according to Christs institution, are denied to be in the Church of Rome.

Againe, that the Church of Rome is not a congregation of faithfull men is proved, because they want, they deny the saving faith of Christ, as hath beene sufficiently proved before.

The second, Argument.

That church wherein saluation ordinarily, or by ordinary meanes cannot be hoped for, is no true visible church of Christ.

But in the Church of Rome saluation ordinarily, or by Ordinary meanes cannot be hoped for.

Therefore the church of Rome is no true visible church of Christ.

For the Proposition it is a Maxime, *Extra Ecclesiam nulla*

*In Salus*; out of the church no saluation necessarily implying, that saluation is onely to bee found in the Church; so that no saluation, no church of Christ: also that a true church of Christ must needs haue the ordinary meanes of saluation.

For the Assumption, it is proued diuers wayes: as the preaching of the Gospell, of the pure word of God, is the onely ordinary meanes to beget faith vnto saluation, Rom. 10. 14. 15. 17. Now the *Gospell, Word, and Faith* of Saluation is not permitted to bee preached or beleeued in the Church of Rome, as wee haue shewed. Wherevpon the learned *Chemnitius* sayth of the Church of Rome: *Infelitem ergo Ecclesiam, cui per Tridentinum Concilium non licebit credere, predicare, vel docere illam beatitudinem hominis, testimonio Moysis, Davidis & omnium Prophetarum confirmatam &c.* O vnhappy and miserable church, for whom the councell of Trent decrees it vnlawfull to belecue, to preach, or teach that blessednesse of man, confirmed by the testimonies of Moyses, of Dauid, and of all the Prophets! For the purpose, they may not preach or teach the sauing doctrines of saluation, as the *Iustifying faith*, which is an affiance particular, and certaine *Iustification by faith*, consisting in the sole imputation of Christs righteounesse, and the like.

Chemnit. Exā.  
de Iustif. pag.  
141. Printed at  
Frankf. 1578.

### Argument 3.

That Church which ouerthroweth and denyeth the *Proposition* onely rule of faith, is no true Church of Christ.

But the Church of Rome ouertwroweth and denyeth *Assumption* the only rule of faith.

Therefore the church of Rome is no true church of *Conclusion* Christ.

For the Proposition: the only Rule of faith is the Scripture or written word of God. Ioh. 5. 39. 2. Tim. 3. 16. Esa. 8. 20. Now to overthrow this Rule, is to overthrow the foundation of the church of God, which is built vpon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, that is, vpon the Scriptures



Scriptures of the New and Old Testament.

For the Assumption: that the Church of Rome hath overthrowne this Rule, it is evident: for first shee hath in the Church of Trent added another Rule of her owne, to wit, *Traditions* and *humaine Inventions*, which are Contrary to the Scriptures as Christ sayth *Math. 15. 16.* For Gods *Arke* and *Dagon* cannot stand together. Secondly they overthrow the Scriptures, the onely rule of faith, while they subiect the authority and sense of it wholly to the Church of Rome, or the Pope, so that Gods word is not receiued of the Church of *Rome*, as it is the word of God, but as the word of men; contrary to the Apostle, *1. Thess. 2. 13.*

#### Argument 4.

*Proposition.* The Church of Antichrist, is not the true Church of Christ.

*Assumption.* But the Church of Rome is the Church of Antichrist:

*Conclusion.* Therefore the Church of Rome is not the true Church of Christ.

For the Assumption *M<sup>r</sup> Cholmley*, grants the Church of Rome to bee Antichristian; hee denies not the Pope to bee Antichrist. And therefore wee take it for granted.

But hee denies the Proposition, saying, that it may bee both the Church of Christ, and of Antichrist, both a whoore, and Christs Spouse. The absurdity whereof wee haue formerly confuted. Or if shee be Christs Spouse why doth shee not reduce the whoore to better order and conformity? But herevnto I adde this Argument following for prooffe of the former.

*Proposition.* The true church of Christ obeyeth not Antichrist as her head.

*Assumption.* But the Church of Antichrist obeyeth Antichrist as her Head.

*Conclusion.* Therefore the church of Antichrist cannot bee the true church of Christ.

All *M. Cholmleys* distinctions here canne take no place.  
For

for Christ expressely faith, *No man can serue two masters, to wit, two opposite and contrary masters; but eisher hee must leaue the one, and hate the other, or cleaue to the one, and forsake the other.* Now what two masters can be more opposite, then Christ and Antichrist? so that the same church, which obeyeth the Pope for her Head, is not subject to Christ, as her Head, and therefore is not the church of Christ. If any man say, that the Pope is but a Ministeriall Head, subordinate to Christ, this is but a Popish colour, & meere shift; for both in doctrine and practise, the Pope is supreme and sole Head of the church of Rome, and so acknowledged, so obeyed, aboue, without, against Christ.

*Argument 5.*

That church, the Head and Members whereof goe into *Proposition.* perdition, is not the true church of Christ.

But the church of Rome, Head and Members, as at this *Assumption* day, goeth into perdition:

Therefore, the church of Rome is no true church of *Conclusion.* Christ.

For the Proposition, it cannot bee denied, for that Ecclesiasticall body, the head and members whereof goe into perdition, cannot bee the true church of Christ, because the true church of Christ goeth not into perdition. Christ is the Sauour of his body, his church, *Ephes. 5. 23.* And where the Head goes, there also goe the members: *Ioh. 14. 3. & 27. 14. 1. Cor. 15. 23.*

For the Assumption thereof; M *Cholmeley* distinguisheth, and saith, that the church of Rome, is both a wife, and a whoore, and as a wife shee receiues Grace from Christ, as a whoore Apostacie from Antichrist. Which distinction I might answer (though answered before) as a plaine Rusticke did the Archbishoppe of Colen, who seeing the Martiallike



Prelate accompanied with armed men, begun to laugh. The Archbishop demanding of him why hee laughed: I laugh (quoth he) at S<sup>r</sup> Peter Prince of Prelates, because he liued and dyed in pouerty, to leaue his successours rich. The Archbishop being nipped, and desirous to cleare himselfe, replied, that hee went with such a troupe, as hee was a Duke. Whereat the Pefant laughing lowder, then before, I would gladly S<sup>r</sup> (quoth hee) know of you, where you thinke the Archbishop should bee, if the Duke, of whom you speake, were in hell. So I may say, if the Church of Rome, as shee is the great whore, goe to hell, what shall become of the Spouse, M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeley speakes of?

*Proposition.*

*Arg. 6.*

*Assumption.*

*Conclusion.*

That Church which holdeth not the Head Christ, is no true Spouse, or Church of Christ.

But the Church of Rome holdeth not the Head Christ.

Therefore the Church of Rome, is no true Spouse, or Church of Christ.

The Proposition is vndeniable, *Eph. 4.16. & 5.23. Col. 1.18.*

The Assumption is proued: that the Church of Rome holdeth not the Head.

*Proposition.*

*Assumption*

*Conclusion.*

That Church, which is wholly idolatrous, holdeth not the Head:

But the Church of Rome is wholly idolatrous, therefore the Church of Rome holdeth not the Head.

The Assumption, not M<sup>r</sup> Cholmeley I hope will deny.

The Proposition is proued by the Apostle, *Col. 1.18.19.* worshipping of Angels, being but one kinde of idolatry, separates from the Head: how much more all kind of idolatry, wherein the Church of Rome is wholly drowned. And what agreement hath the Temple of God with Idols? *2. Cor. 6.16.* And the name of an harlot cannot be withall a member of Christ. See *1. Cor. 15.16.17.*

Besides, shee adhereth to another Head, *ergo*, not to the one and onely true Head, Iesus Christ. See *Bellarmino de Ecclesia*

*Ecclesia militante. lib. 3. cap. 9. & de notis Ecclesia, cap. 10.*

*Argument. 7.*

The true Church of Christ, is Christs Virgin Spouse: *Proposition.*  
But the Church of Rome is not Christs Virgin Spouse; *Assumption.*  
Therefore the Church of Rome is not the true Church *Conclusion.*  
of Christ.

The Proposition is the Apostles, 2. Cor. 11. 2.

The Assumption is proved, because it is confessed euer of M. Cholmeley him selfe, that the church of Rome is the whoore of Babylon: and the same cannot possibly be both a whoore, and a virgin Spouse.

Now though by this virgin Spouse bee meant the Elect of God, yet thee is knowne by the Matron-like habit of the profession of the truth, and by openly disclayming & abhorring all filthinesse of flesh and spirit. So as that which

Augustine said to the Synagogue of the Iewes, I may here apply to Babylon: *Non es Sponsa, quia non es integra. Non enim seruas uni viro fidem, quia catholicam non tenes unitatē.* Aug. contra Iudæos, cap. 12. tom 6.

*Hæc est mater vera, pia mater & casta, intrinsecus sui viri dignitate ornata, non forinsecus mendacio fallente turpiter colorata. And, Caput & corpus Christus, & Ecclesia; nec ab illo separemur, aliud de illo, sicut heretici, credendo, nec ab isto, pravis nostris moribus declinando.*

*Argument. 8.*

The true church of Christ is the true flocke of Christ: *Proposition.*  
But the church of Rome is not the true flocke of Christ.

Therefore the church of Rome is not the true church of Christ. *Assumption.*

The Proposition is vnderstandable. *Cant. 6. 6. Act. 20. 28. Ioh. 10. 16.* *Conclusion.*

The Assumption is proued, *Ioh. 10. 3. 4. 27.* Christs flocke heare his voyce, and know it, and follow it. But the church of Rome heares not Christs voyce, nor know, nor



acknowledge, nor follow it, but the voyce of Antichrist  
and of the Antichristian Synagogue. They heare not  
Christs voyce, as Christs voyce, but as the churches  
voyce. See *Homilie for VVhitesunday part. 2.*

*Argument 9.***Proposition.**

The true church is the Kinges daughter, described  
*Psal. 45.*

**Assumption.**

But the church of Rome is not the Kinges daughter, so  
described:

**Conclusion.**

Therefore the church of Rome is not the true church of  
Christ.

The Assumption is proued: the church of Rome hath  
not one of those native qualities belonging to the Kings  
daughter. For first, the church of Rome doth not hearken  
and encline her eare to Christ, as wee haue proued. Se-  
condly, shee doth not forget her owne people, and her fa-  
thers house, to wit, her Egyptian state, the kingdome of  
this world, and of Satan, the spirituall Pharaoh, but advan-  
ceth it all shee can, preferring it before the kingdome of  
Christ, which is not of this world. Thirdly, instead of  
Christ, the church of Rome acknowledgeth and worship-  
peth the Pope for her Lord God, as supreme ouer all.  
Fourthly, the church of Rome is not all glorious within,  
yea shee stands not vpon inward holines, but is all for out-  
ward glory, Pontifician honour, splendour and magnifi-  
cence: as *Reuel. 17.* All her inwards are filthy ragges, and  
rottenesse, as *Esa: 64. 6.* Note it well.

*Argument: 10.***Proposition.**

The true visible church of Christ is militant on  
earth.

**Assumption.**

But the church of Rome is not militant on earth:

**Conclusion.**

Therefore the church of Rome is no true visible church  
of Christ.

The

The Proposition is undeniable.

The Assumption is proved by the church of Rome's Decretall. See *Sext: de electione cap. 17. lib. 1. ut ergo circa regimen, &c.* where is decreed a triumphat church here on earth, sitting as Queene in *pulchritudine pacis, in Tabernaculis fiducia, in temporalium requie opulenta*: verifying that voyce of Babylon: *Rev. 18. Sedeo Regina, &c.* I sit a Queen, and am no widdow, and shall see no sorrow. And this is established by irrefragable decree, and for euer to indure. See *Platina*, in the life of *Nichol.* the 3. which Pope excluded all imperiall power, and magistracy from bearing any office in Rome.

*Arg. II.*

The church *Malignant*, is not the true church *Militant*. *Proposition.*

But the church of Rome is the church *Malignant*.

Therefore the church of Rome is not the true church *Militant*. *Assumption.*

For the Proposition: the church *Militant*, and the *Malignant*, are diametrically opposite, as the church of God, and Synagogue of Satan: as the two cities, whereof *S<sup>t</sup> Aug.* writ that noble 5<sup>th</sup> *Tome*.

For the Assumption, that the church of Rome is the church malignant, witnes *Revel. 17. 6.* witnes our Booke of Martyrs; witnes the Spanish Inquisition; witnes the Massacres in France, the story of the Waldenses, witnes the vastations in Bohemia, Moravia, Silecia, the Palatinate; and where not?

*Argument 12.*

An hereticall church is not a true church of Christ.

But the church of Rome, is an hereticall church:

Therefore not the true church of Christ.

For the Assumptiō we all grant it, eue they that plead for the church of Rome, they confesse it not to be an Orthodox church. Now if not an Orthodox church, how is it a true church?

*Proposition.*

*Assumption.*

*Conclusion.*



church? yea what church in the world, was ever so hereticall, as that Synagogue of Rome is? It is the *Lerna, Asphalrites*, and sinke of all pestilent heresies. See for this, the learned D *Whittakers* his collation of the present church of Rome, with the auncient Heretickes: *In fine Responsionis ad Demonstrationem Sanderi*: See also the 3 conformities of Popery, written by *Francis de Croy*: specially the third conformity, wherein the church of Rome, is declared to symbolize with all, or most of the old Hereticks: besides the other two conformities in Gentilisme, and Iudaisme. And for the Proposition, who will say, that an hereticall church is a true church? we speake not *de Ecclesia erratica*, but *heretica*: not of an erroneous church, but hereticall. Now an hereticke is hee, that is obstinate in his error, that being conuincd, will not bee reclaimed, but persists, and labours to poyson others with his heresy, propounding it for sound doctrine. Such the Apostle warneth vs to avoyde, as being altogether subuerted, and condemned of his owne conscience. *Tit. 3. 10*. Yea the church of Rome hath herein outstripped all heretickes that euer were, in that shee hath solemnely and irrefragably, and that against the cleare light of Gods word, and of her owne conscience, decreed all her hereticall doctrines to bee receiued, and the contrary truths shee hath accursed.

*Argument. 13.*

*Proposition.* That church which is not *Catholicke*, not *Apostolicke*, not *one*, not *Holy*, is not the true church of Christ.

*Assumption.* But the church of Rome is none of these, not *Catholick*, not *Apostolicke*, not *one*, not *Holy*:

*Conclusion.* Therefore the church of Rome, is no true church of Christ.

The Proposition is granted of all, being defined by the councell of *Constantinople*.

The Assumption is proued; first, themselves confesse no other holinesse requisit to their church but the externall profession of the holines of their doctrine, and of their first founders,

ounders, which what it is, wee all know. Nor can they otherwise defend their definition of a church, as consisting of rotten members. Secondly, they would haue their church one, in regard of vnity of faith. Whence wee may inferre, that the church of Rome can bee called neither catholicke, nor Apostolicke, vnlesse it hold the catholicke and Apostolicke faith. But the catholicke and Apostolicke faith it holdeth not, for it hath not the intire rule of faith, nor the pure preaching of the word, nor the right and lawfull administration of the sacraments, obserued by the Apostles, and instituted by Christ. *Vide D Whitaker, Controuersie 2. Quest. 2. An Ecclesia Romana sit vera Christi visibilis Ecclesia: cap. 3.*

*Argument. 14.*

That church which ouerthroweth the maine & proper *Proposition.* causes of our Salvation, is no true church of Christ.

But the church of Rome ouerthroweth the maine and *Assumption* proper causes of our Salvation:

Therefore the church of Rome is no true church of *Conclusion.* Christ.

The Proposition no man will deny.

The Assumption is proved: For first, they haue overthrowne the principall and fundamentall Article of Iustification, which is the head and summe of all Religion. They erre in the efficient cause of our Iustification, which is the free fauour and grace of God: this they deny, building it vpon mans merit of congruity, or preparatory, and dispositive workes to Iustification, &c. coupling it with mans free will. They erre in the materiall cause, Christs obedience; this they deny to be our obedience, or the matter of our justification. They erre also in the forme of our justification, which is the imputation of Christs righteousness vnto vs. They erre in the instrumentall cause of justification, to wit, the justifying faith, denying it to bee a certaine particular trust or assurance in Gods mercy for the pardon of our sinnes: Yea they erre in the very meritorious cause, Christ.



Christ the Redeemer, ouerthrowing all his offices infinite wayes, excluding an absolute necessity of Christ the Redeemer; for, saith the councell of Trent, *Si quis, &c.* If any man shall say, that all workes which are done before justification, in what regard soeuer they are done, to be truly sinnes, or to deserue Gods hatred, &c. let him be accursed. They erre in the finall cause of justification, being the free gift of eternall life, while they say, the same is merited by condignity. They ouerthrow the fundamentalls of certainty of Salvation, of the sufficiencie of Scriptures, for the rule of faith: of the necessity of the knowledge of the Scriptures for all the people of God; of the pure worship of God alone in spirit and trueth; of the right vse of the Sacraments, while vnto them they attribute grace, *ex opere operato, & intentione Sacerdotis, &c.* deny the true faith; of the trueth of Christs naturall body by their Transubstantiation, as if made of a peece of bread; of the Article of Christs sitting at Gods right hand in the heauens, while they keepe him in euery little box; of the Eucharist to be celebrated in both kindes, to be ministred to all the people; of the onely sacrifice of Christ once made; which they destroy by their propitiatory Masse, and of the one and onely Sacrificer Iesus Christ, who was both Priest, and Sacrifice, and Altar, and whom none could offer but Christ alone. Thus they ouerturne all the fundamentalls of Salvation. For, as for the doctrine of the Trinity, of the Deity simply considered (without Christ, the word incarnate) howsoeuer the church of Rome keepe it intire, yet that of it selfe, is no proper fundamentall of salvation. For though wee are not saued without it, yet by it alone we are not saued. For the saving knowledge of God is in Christ, and not *Extra Christum*, without Christ. *This is life eternall, to know thee, the onely true God, and whom thou hast sent, Iesus Christ.*

Iohn. 17. 3.

*Argument. 15.*

That Church which is wholly Papall, is no true Church of

of Christ.

But the Church of Rome is wholly Papall:

Therefore it is no true Church of Christ.

*Assumption.*

*Conclusion.*

For the Proposition, all Protestant Divines, even those that plead for Rome, confesse it. For the Assumption, it is no lesse true; though Romes Champions, as M<sup>r</sup> Butterfield distinguish betweene the Church of Rome, and the Court of Rome. But this distinction is wholly antiquated and abrogated in these dayes. Before the Councell of Trent, the distinction was of vse, as the reuerend Bishop of Chicester, D Carleton, hath well obserued: but now the whole church of Rome is turned into the court of Rome, and become wholly Papall. They are all head and taile, branch and rush, one intire Papall faction, all combining and confederating in the profession of the Tridentine faith, and practise of all the abominations established by it.

Arg. 16.

That church which hath not the true baptisme of Christ, *Proposition.*  
is not the true church of Christ.

But the church of Rome hath not the true baptisme of *Assumption.*  
Christ.

Therefore the church of Rome is no true church of Christ. *Conclusion.*

The Proposition no man (I hope) will deny. The Assumption I proue: The church of Rome hath not the true baptisme of Christ.

True Baptisme is a seale of the righteousness of faith *Proposition.*  
and of the couenant of grace made vnto vs in Iesus Christ:

But the Baptisme in the church of Rome is not the seale *Assumption.*  
of the righteousness of faith, and of the couenant of grace, made vnto vs in Iesus Christ.

Therefore the Baptisme in the church of Rome is not *Conclusion.*  
the true Baptisme of Christ.

The Proposition is proued from the Apostle, Rom. 4.

11. Baptisme being euery way equiualent to circumcision, in whose stead it succeeded, as *August.* saith, and all acknowledge. The Assumption I proue; for the Church

○

of



Concil. Trid.  
Sess. 7. De Sa-  
cramentis Can.  
6. & 8.

\* So as the Do-  
natists did hang  
the force of bap-  
tisme vpon the  
Ministers con-  
science: Con-  
scientia sancte  
dantis attendi-  
tur, quæ abluat  
accipientis.  
August. contra  
Cresconium. li.  
3. cap. 17.

of Rome denyeth the righteousness of faith, and the justifying faith, yea shee maketh baptism the instrumentall cause of justification, as that it conferres grace *ex opere operato*; and they require not faith in Christ, as necessary for the party to be baptized, but a disposition; and principally the whole force of baptism, and so of all their Sacraments, they hang vpon the \* Priests intention, as wee haue showed else where. So as the Church of Rome hath no more of Baptisme, but only the externall forme of words, together with the element of water: For, A Sacrament is a visible signe of an invisible grace, which invisible grace the church of Rome destroyeth, while she placeth the grace in the Sacrament it selfe: as Sess. 7. de Sacramentis Can. 6. denying and accursing onely faith in Gods promise to be sufficient to receiue grace. Thus they destroy the nature and vse of Christs Sacraments, and so of Baptisme in speciall, while they separate it from the doctrine of the word of God, and from the necessity of justifying faith. Thus that Church is quite remoued from the foundation, and built vpon another, a false foundation. Thus Baptisme to them of that Church, is nothing else, but a seale to a blanke, or which is worse, a sealing vp of their condemnation, while their sins are not washed, but their soules drowned, as the Egyptians in the red sea, a type of Baptisme. Yea they make a very Idoll of their Sacrament, and of the Priest together, while to these they attribute that grace, which the onely Author and fountaine of true Baptisme canne giue. They present their children in the faith of that Church, which denyeth true faith in Christ.

*Obiection.*

Here an obiection is made: if the Church of Rome haue not the true baptism of Christ, why then are not Papists, when conuerted to the true faith of Christ, rebaptized? how stands their former baptism good?

*Answer.*

August. contra  
Cresconium lib.  
1. c. 30. tom. 7.

*Answer.* S. Augustine speaking of the externall forme of Baptisme vsed among Heretickes, saith, that such baptism is not to be repeated but the errour of the Baptisme to be corrected.

corrected. To this purpose Bellarmine himselfe sayth,  
*Cum veniunt ad Ecclesiam baptizati ab Hereticis, agnoscen-*  
*dum est quod est Ecclesia 1. Baptisma, corrigendus verò error.*

*Aug. De Baptismo contra Donat, lib. 7. cap. 40. sayth, The Augustine.*  
 diuine Scriptures in many places do show all those to be stran-  
 gers from the Church, who are not in the rocke, and appertaine

not to the members of the Done, and yet to baptize, and to bee *Sine salute Sa-*  
 baptized, and to haue without saluation the Sacrament of sal- *cramentum sa-*  
 nation. And sayth hee, Heretickes haue lawfull baptisme *luris.*

(that is for the externall forme) but not lawfully. *ib. lib. 5. c.*

17. And else where, *Whence is so great vertue in the water, as*  
*to touch the body, and to wash the heart, but because of the*  
*word? Non quia dicitur, sed quia creditur,* not because it is

uttered, but because it is beleeued. *This is the word of faith,*

And Act. 15. *By faith purifying their hearts.* And Ephes. 5.

*That he might sanctifie his Church, cleansing it in the Laver*  
*of water in the word.* Wherevpon S. Aug. sayth, *Mundatio*

*&c.* Then cleansing should not at all be attributed to the

fluid and slippery element, without this addition, in the

word. This word of faith (sayth hee) is of such force in the

Church of God, as by it beleeuing, offering, blessing, dip-

ping, to cleanse the infant though not yet able with the

heart to beleue to righteousness, and with the mouth to

confesse to saluation. All this (sayth hee) is done by the

word of faith, and by the faith of the word. Now (as wee

showed) the Church of Rome, hauing in the Conncell of

Trent denyed the faith of righteousness, and the righte-

ousnesse of faith, the saving doctrine of Baptisme, she hath

consequently made Baptisme to bee of none effect to her

vnto saluation, but as S. Aug. sayth, of the Donatists, Penall

and pernicious. But now, when any papist is by the grace

of God, and the preaching of the word and of saving faith

conuerted to the true Church of God, the seale of baptisme

is not againe affixed, but the Evidence of saving faith, and

Testament of the Gospell being written in his heart, is now

added to the seale, and so it becomes compleat authentick,



as not being bound necessarily to outward meanes. Nor do we here exclude Gods free agencie in baptisme who in the infant baptized in that hereticall church may (if it please him) worke grace finding his owne water, and his owne words; finding I say his owne scale, he can adde his couenant of grace vnto it, yet no child there baptized coming to the yeares of discretion (vnlesse hee renounce the wicked faith, & relinquish the Idolatrous practise of that Romish church) can haue benefit by his baptisme; but to him it is penall and pernicious, as *Aug.* speakes.

*Argument 17.*

*Proposition.* That church which hath not a lawfull Ministry, is not a true visible church of Christ.

*Assumption.* But the church of Rome hath not a lawfull Ministry.

*Conclusion.* Ergo, the church of Rome is not a true visible church of Christ.

The Proposition is granted of the Papists themselues. The Assumption I proue: The church of Rome, now especially since the Councell of Trent, hath not a lawfull Ordination, therefore not a lawfull Ministry. Not a lawfull Ordination, 1. in regard of the officient cause, either remote, as the Pope, as Head, whence all their Ministeriall power is deriued, or immediate, as the Ordainer, on whose *Intention*, their *gratia gratis data* dependeth. So that here is a nullity in the very foundation of the ordination of the Papall Ministry. It is deriued from the Pope, as Head of the clergy and Church, a tittle merely Antichristian and vsurped, and so their Ministry is antichristian. And if the Pope, being Antichrist and an vsurper, and consecrating Bishops by vertue of his Papall supremacy, as Christs sole Vicar, and *Peters* successor cannot conuey any power of Order vpon his Bishoppes and clergy: what lawfull Ministry canne wee expect in that Apostolicall Synagogue? So that *Caluin* pronounced of them, *Negofub toto Papatu unum esse vere Episcopum*. And if they haue not one true or truly a Bishop, what shall we say of their Priests. *Calu.*

*Caluin. vera Ecclesie reformatio est ratio,*

*vera*

*vera Ecclesia reform. ratio.* Neither haue they any miuiste-  
riall grace, because it depends vpon their Ordainers *Inten-*  
*tion*, & not vpon Christs Ordinance, Grace & promise. 2<sup>ly</sup>,  
they faile in the *Formall* and *finall* cause of *Ordination*.  
They haue quite altered & corrupted the forme, & so the  
end of *Ordination*: for they haue added a new forme, which  
overthroweth the old, and which imposeth a new end, to  
wit, making the whole essence & vse of their Ministry to  
cōsist in Priesthood, in the sacrificing of an Idol, & turning  
the office of a Minister into an Idol. sacrificing priest. See  
their forme of Ordination, set downe in their Trents cati-  
chisme, *Pars secunda: De Ordinis Sacramento n. 23*: where  
(in Ordination) after imposition of hands with the signe  
of the crosse the chalice with wine, & the Paten with the  
Host is deliuered into the hand of the Priest now Ordai-  
ned, with these words, *Accipe potestatem offerendi sacrificium*  
*Deo, Missasq; celebrandi tam pro uiuis, quam pro defunctis &c.*  
Take thou power to offer sacrifice to God, & to celebrate  
Masses as well for the liuing as for the dead &c. And this,  
*precipua Sacerdotis functio existimanda est*, is to be esteemed  
the principall function of the Priest. *Ad extremum uero &c.*  
And in fine, imposing hands againe, Receive thou the holy  
Ghost: whose sins soeuer ye remit &c. *Ecce, Celestis illa &c.*  
And thus the Bishop giueth vnto the Priest that celestiaall  
power of retaining and remitting sinnes, which the Lord  
gave to his Disciples. So there. And wee know that this  
power of remitting & retaining sinnes, the Church of Rome  
placeth not in the dispensing & preaching of the word of  
God, but in their Sacrament of Penance. Thus they haue  
wholly perverted their ordination both for the formall, &  
finall end of it. They faile also in the materiall cause. For  
are made Priests ordinarily, but ignorant persons, such as  
are only able to mumble ouer the Masse and Matins.

But some here object. That in Popish Ordination is con-  
ferred a power to preach the word.

I answer: that in Popish Ordination are vsed those



word of Christ, which the Church of England vseth in Ordination, namely, receiue the Holy Ghost, whose sinnes ye remit &c. which wee indeed do vnderstand of the dispensation of the Word and Sacraments, but the Church of Rome otherwise, namely of the Priests power in binding and loosing, in their Sacrament of Penance. And it is in vaine for them to say, that their Priests in their ordination haue any power conferred vpon them to preach the word of God, when their practise is farre otherwise. Neither indeed is it lawfull for them so to preach the word of God, as it behoueth faithfull Ministers of the Gospell, to wit, purely and soundly, to the sauing of mens soules. For the pure and sound sauing doctrine of the word of God is branded for heresie in the Councel of Trent. Nor may their Bishops or Priests deliuer the sense of it otherwise, then according to the Canons and Decrees of Trent, and the sense of the Church of Rome, as wee haue shewed. Yea the Councell of Trent it selte puts the matter past all aduerture; telling vs plainly, that those words in Ordination *Whose sins yee remit &c.* are not meant of the dispensation, or preaching of the Gospell, but of the power of binding and loosing in the Sacrament of penance. And for prooffe hereof take the whole Canon, Sess. 14. Can. 3. *Si quis dixerit &c.* If any man shall say, that those words of our Lord and Saviour [Receiue the Holy Ghost: whose sinnes yee remit, they are remitted, and whose sins you retaine, they are retained] are not to bee vnderstood of the power of remitting and retaining sinns in the Sacrament of penance, as the Catholicke Church hath from the beginning alwayes vnderstood: but shall wrest them, contrary to the institution of the Sacrament, to the authority of preaching the Gospell: let him bee Anathema. What need wee any more testimony? How justly then might *Caluin*, writing to the King of Poland, say of Romes Clergy, *Totum Sacerdotium Papisticum non solum impia est veri Ministerij profanatio, sed execrabilis in Christum contumelia; & quisquis est Sacerdos papalis,*

*papali, donec titulum illum abiecerit, Christi servus esse ne-  
queat:* The whole Popish Priesthood is not onely an  
impious profanation of the true Ministry, but an execrable  
contumely against Christ: so as, whosoever is a Popish  
Priest, vntill hee cast away that title, hee cannot be Christs  
seruant.

I conclude this with this Argument, taken from the  
definition of true Ordination.

True Ordination is a sacred institution of Christ, where-  
by the Person ordained is invested with a power to  
preach the word of God, and to administer the holy Sacra-  
ments, according to Christs ordinance:

*Proposition.*

But the Ordination vsed in the Church of Rome, is not  
according to Christs institution, to wit, whereby the per-  
son ordained is invested with a power to preach the word  
of God, and to administer the holy Sacraments, according  
to Christs Ordinance.

*Assumption.*

Therefore in the Church of Rome there is no true Or-  
dination; therefore no true Ministry, therefore no true  
Church.

*Conclusion.*

The Proposition is vnderstandable, vnlesse a more exact De-  
finition of true Ordination may haply bee giuen. The  
Assumption is already proued. For first, for administration  
of Sacraments; The Priests power is respectiue and spe-  
cially limited to their Eucharist and Penance: Secondly,  
that Eucharist is a meere Idoll, and blasphemous sa-  
crifice, and no true Sacrament at all: Thirdly, the very  
words of Christ, vsed in true Ordination of all Orthodox  
Churches, which are vnderstood of dispensing the word  
and Sacraments, the Church of Rome peruerteth and wre-  
steth to absolution, meant of a power of dispensing the  
word of God, which sense (saith Trents Canon) is  
wrested contrary to the Institution of this Sacrament  
(of Penance) to the authority of Preaching the Gos-  
pell.

But here comes in a second objection; if in the Church *Objections.*  
of



of Rome there bee not true and lawfull Ordination, why then, when any of their Priests are conuerted to the true faith and Church of Christ, are they not reordained?

*Answer.*

Although their Ordination were altogether vnlawful & vnwarrantable, according to the institution of the Church of Rome: yet comming to vs of the true Church after the pairing and shauing off of their power of sacrificing, and of Sacramentall binding and loosing, and penance, and restoring to the word of Christ (profaned and abused by the to a wrong sense) their originall true meaning and sense; while the Priest conuerted openly renounceth the Masse, and all that abominable Sacrifice, taking the Oath of Supremacy, and subscribing to the Articles and Doctrines of the Church: they are herevpon receiued, and their Ordination now stands good, which before was vicious and Antichristian, as in the case of baptism before. See *M. Francis Mason* his booke of Ordination. lib. 5. cap. 12. in the end of that worke. The same reason is to be giuen of the Ministry of the Church of England, which in times past was deriued & descended from that Antichristian Church.

Thus hauing shewed that in the Church of Rome there being no true and lawfull ordination of Ministry according to Christs institution, but that they are ordained to be Idolatrus Priests, offering that wasser Idol vp in sacrifice which them selues haue made, this being the principall part of their Priestly function, and to which their whole seruice is referred. We conclude that the Church of Rome is no true visible Church of Christ.

But before we make an end, some objections more (being moued by our Antagonists, and Romes Champions, as one *M. Butterfield*, a young man of good hopes, if the want of preferment do not draw him to seeke to make vp the mouth of his hopes, with the maintaining of bad causes) are to bee remoued; but briefly; because the maine dint, of what may bee more objected is already cleared, as falling in coincidently with *M. Cholmleyes* Arguments.

*Ob.*

**Ob.** Wee must distinguish betweene the Church of Rome, and Babylon in the Church.

The Church of Rome, now since the councell of Trent, *Ans.* is all Babylon; it is wholly a Papall faction, and confederacy. The Spirit of Iesuitisme deriued from, and founded in the councell of Trent, or rather in hell, domineereth and swayeth euerywhere. The Kingdome of *France* indeed, stood out at the councell of Trent, but where about? For matter of doctrine? No such thing: but in some points of Prerogative, as the power of Collation and Investiture of Ecclesiastick Promotions, & the like. But in all Trent-Doctrines and Decrees, the Sorbonists haue yeelded vnanimous assent, and we know too well, that *France* is wholly swayed by the Iesuiticall generation. So that all Papists and Popish states, doe admit of, and yeeld to the Canons and Decrees of the Councell of Trent, as the rule and square of Faith and doctrine.

**Ob. 2.** The Church of Rome is as a diseased body onely, which though neuer so corrupt, yet is a true body still. As he is a true man, to whom the definition of a man agreeth, indued with a reasonable soule, though his body bee neuer so much diseased, as with Plague or Leprosy.

*Ans.* Many deceiue themselues with this comparison. They should first proue the Church of Rome to bee a liuing Church, before they can properly compare the body of it to the body of a liuing man. Els it is a begging of the question. For I deny the Church of Rome to be an Organical body, to wit, a liuing body. It is a meere dead corrupt carcase. And as a dead corrupt corps is not an organical body, as wanting the soule to actuate it, & so cannot be called truly a man, or a mans body, but a corpse: no more is the Church of Rome, (being no lesse dead, then diseased) a true Church, as *Aristotle* noteth, A dead member to be but equivocally a member: as *Bellarmin* also confesseth of Romes members. Neither will it follow, that because there may bee an hidde Church of God within the borders of the Church of Rome: that therefore the Church of Rome is a true visible Church.



For if any among them bee of the number of Gods sacred ones before their effectuall calling, they are members of that Antichristian Church, but being called: they are no more of it, but in it, and their being in it, will neuer proue it a true Church.

*Obiect. 3.*

*Ob.* The Church of Rome is no worse, then the Churches of Iudah and Israel, when they were corrupted with Idolatry, or when they were in the worst estate: but euen in that estate they were the Churches of God: and why not aswell the Church of Rome?

*Answer.* The Church of Rome, as now it standeth, since the Councell of Trent, is infinitely worse, and more corrupted, then euer was either the Church of Iuda, or of Israel vnder the revolted Kingdome of *Ieroboam*, and his successours. And that in these regards: 1. because in the most deplored times of these Churches, God failed not to send his Prophets early and late to admonish and teach them. They had the Ministry of the Word of God to direct them, yea and miracles also to draw them, as *1 King. 18* &c. And this word was not without effect: for in the daies of *Elias*, euen within the lists of that revolted Kingdome vnder wicked *Ahab*; God had reserved his 7000, that had not bowed the knee to *Baal*. Thus God kept and continued his Church in those worst times; But where is there one Prophet or Preacher in the Church of Rome, that in these dayes, doth or dare preach the pure Word of God, or reprove the base and abominable Idolatries of the Church of Rome, and the infinite corruptions of that kingdome of Antichrist? Where is there one *Savonarola left*? Both not the Inquisition, and *Index Expurgatorius* hush all true Prophets, and Prophecys in that Church? Or where haue they (for all their lying bragges) any one true Miracle? Secondly, the corruption, idolatry, and errors in those Israelitish Churches were onely *de facto*, but not *ex Decreto*, they were not solemnely ratified by Decrees and Canons. But the horrible abominations in the Church of Rome,

Rome, are not only of practise, but they stand vpon irrefragable Decrees and Canons, and that vnder most direfull Anathema, to be obserued of all, as the inviolable and perpetuall rule of their religion. Thus did Israel neuer, for any thing we read in Scripture. Onely *Ieroboam* by his perswasion allured and drew his people away by a great Apostacy to their vtter confusion at length. Yet a long time God had a hidden Church among them. And besides, we must euer put a difference betweene those two Kingdomes of *Iuda* and *Israel*, at least wise for the Temple, Arke, Sacrifice, Priests and Leuites sakes. Thirdly, the Bookes of *Moses* were still in force for their authority, as the rule of faith neuer altered, although for a time intermitted and neglected in corrupt times: but the Church of Rome hath robbed the Scriptures of their diuine authority, restrained their natieue sense to the censure of the Church, and quite ouerthrowne them, by adding a new rule of faith. Thus neuer did the Church of *Iuda* & *Israel* in their most forlorne estates.

Fourthly, All those that adhered to *Ieroboams* Idolatry in worshipping the calues, could expect no other, but damnation, without repentance; according to the Apostles sentence, *No Idolater, &c. shall enter into the Kingdome of Heauen.* To prevent which, GOD hath reserued to himselfe 7000 that were no Idolaters, that bowed not the knee. Object. 4.

The Church of Rome hath onely added to the foundation, not taken away, or subtracted from it: and the nature of an addition, is not directly to deny, but by consequence at the most.

*Answer.* We haue already proued, that they haue destroyed the Foundation, and that both by Subtraction, and Additions; as their Traditions and Decrees quite overthrow the Foundation of Scriptures. For if the Scriptures affirme one thing, and Traditions another, these are obeyed, those rejected. And doe not Additions directly over-



throw? What say you to invocation of Saints? doth it not directly ouerthrow the pure worship of God, and faith in him alone? Doth not the Masse directly ouerthrow the one and onely Sacrifice of Christ once made? And so in the rest. For Additions being contrary and contradictory to the Foundation, *posito uno tollitur alterum*, the one being put, takes away the other. Againe, they haue sacrilegiously subtracted, and that directly from the foundation, as from the authority of Gods Word, as the only Rule of faith, and infallible Iudge of controversies; from the Sacrament, by taking away both the cup, and the bread; from sauing faith, by denying it the natiue & genuine properties, & the like. Yea Addition only were sufficient to ouerthrow the foundation. Did not the Addition of circumcision among the *Galatians*, ouerthrow the foundation, to wit, justification by Christ? Read *Gal. 5. 2, 3, 4*. See also the learned and reuerend D Featly his writ of errour; in his *Pelagius Rediuidus*.

Againe, M *Butterfield* mistakes the word [*Directly*,] as vnderstanding all along for [*Expressely*.] The Church of Rome doth not in expresse termes perhaps, or *totidem verbis* deny, but *directly* shee doth, and that by direct and necessary consequence, yea by direct and expresse contradiction in many things. And *direct* and *necessary consequence* is sufficient to proue their direct denyall of the foundation.

*Obiect. 5.* It is the judgment of many learned Protestant Diuines, that the Church of Rome is a true Church.

*Ans.* Although we haue answered this before, yet we will here adde a word or two, to cleare all scruples. First; all learned Protestant Diuines doe not say so, for I can bring as many, & as learned, that are of the contrary judgment. Secondly, if those Authors, that seeme to allow the Church of *Rome* for a Church, bee but rightly vnderstood, and reduced to their owne Principles, they will bee found of this minde with the Church of *England*, that the

the Church of *Rome* is no true Church of Christ: Let *Iunius*, so often and strongly vrged by *Romes* Champions, suffice for instance: who though indeed hee say much, and too much, and more then ever he either can, or doth proue, (for all his distinctions & qualifications are without book, having no more authority, but *Ipse dixit*, without any demonstration) yet being reduced and limited to his owne Principles, and Premisses, he must needs yeeld to the contrary conclusions. For first he sets downe three proper and principall markes of the true and visible Church of Christ, to wit, first, the Administration or dispensation of the word of salvation, out of the holy Scripture & the unchangeable rule of faith. Secondly of the Sacraments, which God hath annexed to the Word, that Ministers may deliuer the same, so as they haue receiued of the Lord, 1 Cor. 11. And thirdly, the obseruation of discipline in gouernment and manners, &c. Againe, The principall parts (saith hee) are Pastors and Congregations, or Flocks, deliuering and receiuing the sauing word of life; of the combination of which parts, the whole body of the Church is compacted in the vnicity of the diuine Spirit and Word. *Hæc compositio* &c. This composition or coagmentation of the eternall forme is rightly called a Note of the Church, whereby we acknowledge it from the sacred Scriptures, and the light of Gods Spirit; So, as the Lord inhabiting in his Church, hath commanded it so to be constituted, and discerned from others. *Horum alterum si deest, Ecclesia esse definit. Sin vtrumq; adest, rectè Ecclesia dicenda est:* If either of these bee wanting, it ceaseth to bee a Church, but if both, bee there it is rightly called a Church. So *Iunius*. Now these grounds being layde, without which a true Church cannot bee, or be discerned: how can it bee inferred, that the Church of *Rome* is a true visible Church of CHRIST, seeing it wanteth these proper and peculiar markes of a true Church? Nor doth *Iunius* show any-where, that the Church of *Rome* hath these Notes and Markes.



Nor are there any Protestant Divines, but acknowledge those markes to bee necessary to know a true Church of Christ by, which if they bee wanting, it ceaseth to bee a Church, in ~~Inim~~ his opinion, yea and in all sound Protestants opinions, seeing it ceaseth to be a true visible Church of CHRIST. If then no Church can be a true visible Church without these proper markes, which all Protestant Divines approue: then how can the Church of Rome bee a true visible church of Christ, which is destitute of these Markes? And that it wants these Markes, witnesse the Church of *England* in her Doctrines: as Homily for Whitsunday, part. 2. where the church of Rome is by many markes proued and concluded to bee no true church of Christ.

*First it wants these true and proper Markes of a true Church: For neither are they built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, retaining the sound and pure doctrine of Christ Iesu, neither doe they order the Sacraments, or els the Ecclesiasticall Keyes in such sort, as hee did first institute and ordaine them, &c. And there Aug. his argument is alledged: Whosoever doe dissent from the Scriptures concerning the Head although they bee found in all places, where the Church is appointed; yet are they not in the Church: a plaine place, concluding directly against the church of Rome. Againe, they want the Spirit of God. If it be possible to bee there, where the true Church is not, then is it at Rome. Againe, Hee that is of God, heareth Gods Word: whereof it followeth, that the Popes in not hearing Christs voyce, &c. doe plainely argue to the World, that they are not of Christ, nor yet possessed with his Spirit. And much more to this purpose there, to which I referre the Reader.*

Now as I haue vindicated this Homily of my Mother Church from the corrupt glosse of M. Cholmley, with who also M. Butterfield jumpes, *fratres in malo*: so let me conclude all this discourse, with adding a word or two in defending & clearing our Church about the foresaid markes, nibbled

mibbled at by M. *Butterfield*. For as for his aspersions and vilifications of my person, his taunts and scoffes, I passe them by, considering them as sparkles leaping out of the boyling brest of juvenile ardour, and youthfull petulancy, as hauing gotten licence vnder Scale to insult ouer his betters; as if hee could not gratify his Lord, but by vilifying his brother; But I trust either Gods grace, or time and experience will qualify and temper, and reduce to better conformity such exorbitances.

Now first, M. *Butterfield* (pag. 83) may know, that I doubt not, but the Homilies doe containe sound doctrines of our church. If hee had reade my Plea to the Appeale, hee would haue vnderstood the reason of these wordes, *if the Homilies containe any part thereof*. For others doubted of it, not I. Againe, hee must remember, that the question is, not simply and strictly of a church, but of the true church of Christ; visible; In the demonstration whereof, the foresayde markes are requisite. Thirdly, the church of *England* there, speakes not of the church of Rome; as taking advantage, as if the injury of an age, or so, had imposed a present necessitie of interruption in the Word of GOD and Sacraments, according to CHRISTs Institution, but it speakes of an inveterate disease, which for so many hundred yeares had corrupted the state of that Church, which now was growne incurable. For who denyes but the church of GOD may for a time suffer an Eclipse, or interruption in the ordinary publicke ministration of the Word and Sacraments, and yet bee a true church still? But take these publicke markes quite away, and where is the visibilitie of the church?

In *Elias* his time, GOD had a church in the Apostatized Kingdome of *Israel*, 7000. &c: but it was not a visible church; *Elias* saw it not, for hee saide, *I am left alone*. In the wilderness also the vse of circumcision was restrained, but that was in case of necessitie, for which they ceased



sed not to be a true visible Church, hauing the Ministry of the Word, the Law among them, the Arke. &c. But with the Church of *Rome* it is farre otherwise: they haue rejected and corrupted the Word of God, and that by solemne Decree and Canon irrevocable, they haue ouerthrowne the rule of Faith, so as they are no longer built vpon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, as our Church saith. And if this were true then, which was but about the time of the councell of Trent: how much more now?

But, saith M *Butterfield*, *This argument alledged (of our Churches Markes) concludes affirmatiuely, not negatiuely*, that where these markes are, there is a Church: not where they are not, there is no Church.

How? Affirmatiuely, not negatiuely? Yes, negatiuely also, and that, not onely by consequence, but expressly also. First, Expressly our Church concludes negatiuely, as we haue shewed. And secondly, by necessary consequence infallibly; for our Church speaks by way of definition of a Church, describing it by the proper markes; now a definition we know, is exclusiue and negatiue, in regard of that to which it is opposed, as *Proprium quomodo*; which I hope M *Butterfield* hath not so soone forgotten, hauing bin but the other day, a Iunior Sophister.

But to conclude and summe vp the verdict of all sound Protestant Diuines vpon this point.

That Church which all sound Protestant Diuines without exception, deny to haue the proper and essential markes of a true Church, is by their verdict, consequently no true visible Church of Christ.

But all sound Protestant Diuines, without exception, deny the Church of *Rome* to haue the proper and essential markes of a true visible Church.

Therefore the Church of *Rome* is by the verdict of all sound Protestants concluded to bee no true visible Church of Christ.

Againe,

Againe, what one sound Protestant doth say, that the church of Rome is a *true Church*? A church, some say; but not a *true Church*. No not *Innius*, the most vexed and quoted Authour about this point. Note it well: *Innius* his question is, *virum Ecclesia Romana Papalis, sit Ecclesia*. And he concludes, *Qua Papalis, &c.* As it is Papall, it is no church. Which opposite branch of his distinction, our common quoters smoothly and clearely leaue out, contenting themselves with the former branch, which seemes to smile vpon them. But we haue proted, that the present church of Rome is wholly Papall. Therefore no church, vnlesse *equiuoce*, which may denominate the Antichristian church.

But M *Butterfield* confesseth, that Gods word is not purely taught in the church of Rome, &c. yet hee addeth a qualification; *Neither can wee thinke* (saith hee) *but that they are much sonnder in their sermons, then in their disputations.*

And why, I pray you, can you not thinke otherwise? But if zeale (M *Butterfield*) had carried you to that Popish Sermon, in the Blacke-Friers, vpon that their dismall fifth of *November*, and you had escaped away with a broken legge, or crasht arme, or so, you might then, past thinking, feelingly & experimentally haue certified & pacified vs, what sound notes the Iesuite deliuered for the edification, or building vp of mens soules, when through the remarkable judgement of God, hee pulled downe an old house vpon his owne, and hearers heads, *in perpetuam rei infamiam*. Otherwise, M *Butterfield*, doe not thinke, that wee will bee so easily perswaded by your bare thinking; although *wee must*, say you. And why may you not as well thinke, that their *sermons*, are as vnfound, as their *disputations*? why should you not thinke, that a wolfe is a wolfe, as well when he preyeth vpon the sheep, as when he quarrelleth with the shepheards dog? Or haue you bin at any time bittē by such wolues in *disputatio*, that you should hope they will deale better with you in their

Q

sermons?



sermons? A wolfe is a wolfe though hee come in a sheepes skinne. And of such, Christ warnes vs to beware. Beware then, M<sup>r</sup> *Butterfield*, you doe not befoole your owne simplicity, or blind charity, as to beleive, or make any of your simple Readers imagine, that a wolfe in a sheepes skinne, will not be so cruell to the sheepe, as in his owne to the dogge.

But, for the Sacraments, it is true (saith he) *they have defiled the Ordinances of God, with their indecent rites; yet can they not hereby make them nullities; much lesse by their erroneous opinions evacuate the force of them.* It is well that M<sup>r</sup> *Butterfields* youth, may plead for a pardon of his simplicity. Hee findes nothing amisse in the church of Romes depraving, or defiling the Sacrament, *but a few indecent Rites.* Well: what more? Their Baptisme, for the substance of it, is holy, and good, and effectuell (no doubt) to them that receive it, as ours! Nay bate an asse. But this wee have confuted before, about Baptisme. But what saith hee of their Eucharist? *The Eucharist is to them that partake of it (if they bee worthy receivers) a true Sacrament, notwithstanding their teachers opinion of Transubstantiation. That they are debarred of the Cup in the holy Communion, is the sacriledge of the Ministers of that Synagogue, and the want thereof shall not be prejudiciall to those, that unsainedly desire it, &c.* If our Mother Church doe not all the sooner chastise this her young sonne, or at least, chatechise him better in the Principles of Religion, shee may bee in great danger to loose him, as being already possesse with a strong erroneous conceit of Popery, vnesse in the last place some preferment stay him, which yet were the way to harden him in his error, and to hearten him to goe on in such a thriving course, in case some good benefice, or prebend bee conferred vpon him, for this his good service. And truly, for my part, I did not thinke it possible, there had beene any one Minister of the church of England, so rude in the rudiments of his religion, whose religion is not grounded  
vpon

vpon worldly respects, as to utter such an vnfound, vn-  
 sorry speech as this. And where will he finde one worthy  
 Receiuer in the church of Rome, that is not perswaded, he  
 eates his God, flesh, blood, and bones, in the Host? How  
 is it then a true Sacrament? Nay, is it not a *meere* figment,  
 an *Idol*, a *nothing in the world*? If it then haue not the na-  
 ture of a Sacrament, sith the element is destroyed: how  
 can it haue any Sacramentall force or efficacie? Or how  
 can a blind Idolator, bee a worthy Receiuer, when all the  
 faith required of him, is to beleue a nullity of the bread,  
 and carnall reality of Christs body, instead thereof? And  
 will not God lay this to the Idolatrous peoples charge?  
 Not at all? This is a pretty incouragement for simple Pa-  
 pists to continue in their Idolatry, so they doe but vnfa-  
 inedly desire the cup in the Eucharist. But will their desire  
 of a drop of wine, profit them more, then Diues his desire  
 of a drop of water to coole his tongue? For what other  
 desire can they haue, but carnall, when they belieue, that in  
 the cup to bee no wine, but blood? But till they desire, as  
 they should doe, which is by faith to hunger and thirst af-  
 ter Christ, which onely maketh them worthy receiuers:  
 will not God (trow you M<sup>r</sup> Butterfield) lay this to your  
 charge, that you so dawbe and varnish ouer an abominable  
 Idoll, as if it were Gods sacred Ordinance? Can you so  
 lightly passe ouer Transubstantiation, and the sacrilege  
 of the cup, as if they were but some *undecent rites, that only*  
*defile, but nullifie not, nor evacuate the force of the Sacra-*  
*ment? But, as the man is, so is his strength.* And as the King  
 of Israel pursuing the Moabite, and seeing him desperately  
 to goe sacrifice his eldest sonne, returned in indignation,  
 and pursued no farther: So I will here stint my pursuite,  
 crauing leaue, to leaue the battell, when I see the Aduersa-  
 ry so hard driuen, as to offer vp his eldest sonne, even rea-  
 son it selfe, if not soule and conscience and all, as a sacri-  
 fice to the Idoll.

2 King. 3.

Wee will close vp all, with one Objection more, which *Obiection. 6.*

Q 2

is



is made in the behalfe of the church of Rome: How can the church of Rome but be a true church of Christ, when it is said, that Antichrist sitteth in the Temple of God, & when wee say, that the Pope is Antichrist?

*Answer.*

Answer. That the Pope is Antichrist, I wonder any Diuine should question, that knowes the Scriptures. That Antichrist is said to sit in the Temple of God, as God, this being rightly vnderstood, doth not onely proue the Pope to bee Antichrist, but the church of Rome the church of Antichrist, and not the church of God. For first to sit, doth signifie to raigne and rule. So *Augustine* and *Aquinas*. It is Babylons voyce, *Sedeo Regina*, I sit a Queene. And it is a phrase proper to the Pope, none is faide to sit, (that is papally to raigne) but hee. Such a Pope sate so long, saith *Platina*, vsually. *Hee sits as God*, not God simply, but *as God*, that is, *Vice-Deus*, Vice-God. It is very remarkeable, which *Platina* obserueth, that *Boniface* 3. who first vsurped the title of Antichrist, to bee vniuersall Bishop, was the first Pope, that gaue this Motto, *Volumus & Inuenimus*, Wee Will, and Command. Here began the Popes raigue. Thus Antichrist raignes.

Where, or ouer whom? *Hee sits as God*, *In the Temple of God*. *Augustine* tels, that many in his time expounded it, for, or, *Instead of the Temple of God*, as if Antichrist himselfe were the Temple of God. And is not the Pope *instar Ecclesie*, the church collectiue and representatiue in himselfe?

*Origen* before him saith, that some before him expounded the Temple of God, of the Scriptures; as the Pharisees were said to *sit in Moses chaire*, to wit, the doctrine of *Moses* Law. And doth not the Pope beare rule ouer the Scriptures? The vncertaine Authour vpon *Matthew*,

saith vpon these wordes, *When yee shall see the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place*: "that is, saith hee, 'When yee shall see wicked heresie, which is the host of 'Antichrist, standing in the holy places of the church, then 'let them which are in Iudea, flee to the Mountaines; that

*Aqu. in 2. Thes.*  
2.

*Aug. de Civit.*  
*Dei, lib. 20. c. 19.*

*Origen in Mat.*  
*Tract. 27.*

*In cap. Mat. 24.*  
*Item 49.*

95. They which are in Christianity, let them betake  
 them to the Scriptures: For as a true Iew is a true  
 Christian, as *Rom. 2. 29.* so true Iudea, is Christia-  
 nity. Now the Mountaines are the Scriptures of the  
 Apostles and Prophets, whereof it is said, Her founda-  
 tions are vpon the holy hills. And why doth hee  
 charge at this time all Christians to haue recourse to  
 the Scriptures? Because in the time of Antichrist,  
 Christians, who are desirous to know the verity of  
 faith, haue no other refuge but the holy Scriptures.  
 Because all those things, which are properly Christs in  
 trueth, the same hath heresie in a type. They haue  
 Churches, the Scriptures, Baptisme, the Eucharist, Bi-  
 shops, and other Orders. Now in such a confusion, how  
 is it possible, to know the true church, but by the Scrip-  
 tures? If, as true Christians, wee would retaine the  
 firmnesse of true faith. They that doe otherwise shall pe-  
 rish, because they cannot know the true church. So hee  
 Which how pregnant & cleare a Prophecy it is of the pre-  
 sent state of the Antichristian church of Rome, all men do see.

In a word, The Temple of God here, wherein Antichrist  
 is said to sitte, is taken either materially, for the publicke  
 place of diuine worship, or mystically and spiritually, for  
 the church of God, & the members of Christ, who are cal-  
 led the Temples of God. If materially, it signifies, that An-  
 tichrist doth usurpe those places for his Idol service, &  
 Antichristian religiō, which formerly had bin dedicated to  
 Gods pure worship, and which now no otherwise retaine  
 the name of the Temple of God, then Bethel did \* of \* *Gen. 28. 19.*  
 olde, when *Ieroboams* golden calfe was erected in it,  
 vvhich turned *Bethel* into *Bethauen*, the house of *Amos. 7. 13.*  
 God into the house of iniquity. Secondly, if wee take *Osc. 4. 15.*  
 the Temple of God here mystically and spiritually, for  
 the true church of Christ, and his liuing members, though  
 it bee true, that Antichrist hath no power ouer them,  
 yet wee all know, that hee challengeth and vsurpeth a



Extravag. v-  
nam sanctam,

Soveraigne power ouer the faith, the soule, the conscience of all Christians; that *it is of the necessity of Salvation for every creature to be subject to the Pope*, is the Popes owne Decree, so famous and well knowne. Thus *he sits as God in the Temple of God*. Doth hee therefore indeede beare rule in, and ouer Gods Saints, those liuing Temples? Or are those the liuing Temples, in, or ouer whom hee sitteth, that is, raigeth by his plenary power? No such thing. But this Antichrist assumeth, vsurpeth, challengeth, boasteth of. As the Apostle addeth. *αποδείκνυσεν ιδιον οτι εις θεος: demonstrating, or shewing himselfe, that hee is God*, invested in all diuine power and authority ouer the church. And doth not the Pope monopolize, and Catholickise (as I may so say) the church of Rome, to wit, all those Congregati-  
ons, that adhere to him, as members to the Head, as the onely Catholicke Church ouer the earth, as the onely *Temple of God*, wherein hee sitteth and domineereth? Doth he not make show and ostentation hereof, that he is the onely *αυτος θεος, As God*, or Vice-God, that *sitteth*, that raigeth in the *Temple of God*? Doth hee allow any other Temple of God, but where himselfe sitteth? Doth hee not deny Salvation to all, who are not in and of this Temple? And doth he not sitte, supreme Iudge in the tribunall of euery mans conscience and faith, ouer whom hee hath vsurped Headship? Is not one of his chiefe merchandizes, *the soules of men*, which he disposeth of at his pleasure? so as, though he carry millions of soules with him into hell, to bee with himselfe tormented of the great Devill, yet none must controule him, or say, *why doest thou so*? As his owne Decretals say.

Now from that which hath beene said of Antichrists sitting in the Temple of God, I collect this conclusiue Argument.

*Proposition.*

That Temple, wherein the Pope, or Antichrist raigeth, as in the onely Temple of God, is not the true Church of Christ visible.

But

But the church of Rome is that Temple wherein the *Assumption.*  
 Pope, or Antichrist now raigneth, as in the onely Temple  
 of God:

Therefore the church of Rome is not the true church of *Conclusion.*  
 Christ visible.

The Assumption no man will deny, vnlesse hee that  
 denyeth the Pope to bee Antichrist. But it skils not, so he  
 grant the Pope there to raigne which hee cannot denie.

The Proposition I proue: By true church of Christ, is  
 meant, either the Catholicke Church, or a member and  
 branch of it, as a particular church of Christ visible: but  
 that Temple, wherein the Pope sitteth and raigneth, as in  
 the onely Temple of God, is neither the Catholicke  
 Church, nor a true member and branch of it visible: there-  
 fore it is no true church of Christ. That the church of  
 Rome is the catholicke church, all sound Protestants  
 deny, that it is a member only of the catholick, the church  
 of Rome denyeth, shee will be all, or none. And seing shee  
 will bee all or none, shee must needes be none at all.

Againe, that the church of Rome is not the catholicke  
 church, I proue it:

That church, which necessarily is affixed and appropri- *Proposition.*  
 ated to one place, is not the catholicke church.

But the church of Rome is necessarily affixed and ap- *Assumption*  
 propriated to one place:

Therefore it is not the catholicke church. *Conclusion.*

The Proposition is proued, *Ioh. 4. 23. Mar. 13. 21.*  
*Mat. 28. 19. 20. Act. 10. 35.*

The Assumption the Papists assume to themselves. For  
 the foundation of that church is laid vpon the Romane  
 mountaines; vpon *Peter*, Bishop of Rome, say they; so that  
 if *Peter* proued neuer to haue beene at Rome, farewell the  
 church of Rome. It ceaseth to be a church, if Rome be not  
 the only Metropolis, Lady, and Mistresse of the world, and  
 denominate the catholicke church, the Romane catholicke  
 church. This is that great mysticall Babylon. This is that

*Roma*



*Roma eterna*, the name of blasphemy written in the forehead of the purple whoore, as *S<sup>t</sup> Hierome* speakes. This then is the infallible marke of the false church, of that whoore of Babylon, challenging to her selfe the sole title and interest of the whole, to be solely called the Catholick Church, out of which is no Salvation.

*Proposition.*

Againe: That church, which challengeth to be the only Temple and church of God, excluding the true and Orthodox churches of God, as false & hereticall, which acknowledge not her for their Head and Mistresse, is no true visible church of Christ.

*Assumption*

But the church of Rome is such: shee challengeth to be the onely Temple and church of God, excluding the true and Orthodox churches of God, as false and hereticall, which acknowledge not her for their Head and Mistresse.

*Conclusion.*

Therefore the church of Rome, is no true visible church of Christ.

The Assumption is evident.

The Proposition is no lesse cleare. For, any particular church, as that of Rome, challenging to bee the onely church, and excluding all Orthodox churches as false and hereticall, which acknowledge not her for their Metropolis and Mistresse, is a proud, schismaticall, and Apostaticall church, and so remaining an obstinate Hereticke, and schismaticke, hath no communion with the catholicke church of Christ, or with any the branches of it. And any church, which excludeth Orthodox churches as false and hereticall, & that, not only for not acknowledging her for their Metropolis & Mistresse, but because they maintain & professe the saving truth of Christ: is not onely an egregious Schismaticke, but a notorious Heretick, \* in decreeing the saving doctrines of Christ for heresie, and decreeing maintaining, and professing the contrary. Now all this the church of Rome doing, proclaimeth her selfe to all the world, to bee both a monstrous Hereticke incorrigible,

\* Bulla Pii 4.  
super forma ju-  
ramenti profes-  
sionis fidei.  
Witnesse also the  
whole Councell  
of Trent.

incorrigible, and notorious schismaticke vnreconcilable. Whence I conclude.

No Church that is obstinately schismaticall, damnably hereticall and Apostaticall, vnreconcilibly separating herselfe from the true Catholicke Church, and the true visible branches thereof, is a true visible Church of Christ. *Proposition.*

But the Church of Rome is obstinately schismaticall, damnably hereticall and Apostaticall, vnreconcilably separating herselfe from the true Catholicke Church, and the true visible branches thereof. *Assumption.*

Therefore the Church of Rome is is no true visible Church of Christ. *Conclusion.*

Yet one more, for M<sup>r</sup> *Cholmley* and M<sup>r</sup> *Butterfield* to ruminare vpon.

Either the Church of Rome is no true visible Church of Christ, or else the Church of England must needs be no true visible Church of Christ. *Proposition.*

But the Church of England is a true visible Church of Christ. *Assumption.*

Therefore the Church of Rome is no true visible Church of Christ. *Conclusion.*

The Assumption I hope they will not deny. If they deny the Proposition, I proue it: Things of different definitions haue different denominations: but the Church of England and that of Rome, are of different definitions, as concerning a true visible Church: therefore both of them cannot bee true visible Churches; but if the one bee true, the other is false. Now that which demonstrates and denominates the Church of England to bee a true visible Church, doth *ipso facto* exclude and deny the Church of Rome to bee a true visible Church, as wee haue proued before by the proper markes of a true visible Church. On the other side, that which the Church of Rome brings to shew herselfe to bee the true visible Church, if it bee true shee saith, doth necessarily exclude the Church of England from being a true visible Church. For the visibility of the

R Church



church of Rome consists in an vnion betweene that church and her visible Head the Pope, vnto whom they must bee subject vnder paine of damnation. But this visibility of a true Church, the Church of England disclaimeth. The Church of England then, and the Church of Rome, standing in opposite termes touching the definition of a true visible Church, cannot both of them bee a true visible church of Christ. Vpon this reason the church of Rome denies the church of England to bee a true visible church, but false and hereticall, and wherein saluation is not to bee found, because it is without the verge, forsooth, of the Roman catholicke church. And what reason then hath any Minister of the church of England, of what ranke soeuer, to acknowledge the church of Rome for a true visible church of Christ? Doth hee not by a necessary consequence conclude, that the church of England is no true visible church of Christ? For these two, as contradictories, expell each other: for wherein the church of England shewes herselfe to bee a true visible church of Christ, shee therein denies the church of Rome to bee a true visible church of Christ: and wherein the church of Rome vants herselfe to bee the true catholicke visible Church, shee therein shuts out the Church of England as hereticall and schismaticall, as hauing no communion with the catholicke church. And yet shall we say, that, *wee detest not to hold communion with the Church of Rome?* Fye for shame, that wee should bee so base to scrape acquaintance with that beldame Babylonian whore, when her bold face, and insolent forehead stickes not to brand vs for forlorne heretickes, shut out from saluation, till wee returne to the Antichristian yoke againe. No maruaile then, if recusants flap our Ministers in the mouth with this, that the best in our Church confesse theirs a true church, and saluation there to bee found: but wee (say they) do not acknowledge you a true church, wherein saluation

variation is to be found, therefore we are vpon a sure ground.  
 This was objected to one of our Ministers of late by a  
 great Recusant. And are wee not well enough serued?  
 For if we will needes call the whore Christs Spouse: why  
 should she not requite vs, by calling our Mother a whore?  
 But here an end.

*Vive, vale: si quid novisti rectius istis,*

*Candidus imperti: si non, his utere mecum:*

Live, blest: if ought more right then these you see.

Kindly impart: if not, take part with mee.

*1. Kings 18. 21.*

*If the Lord bee God, follow him: but if Baal bee  
 hee, or if Babel be shee, then  
 goe after them.*

To God only be glory. Amen.

FINIS.





action is to be taken, there we are upon the ground of  
 this was objected to one of our Ministers of law by a  
 great Lecturer. And are we not well enough informed  
 for it we will needs call the whole Church's spouse: why  
 should we not require vs, by calling our Mother's whores?  
 But here an end.

Concerning the  
 Church & Clergy  
 of Engl:

## Errata in the Epistle to the Bishop of Exon.

Page 1, line 18, for the more, reade phrase, l, 27, r, in Peter, 6, page 1, l. 20, read Lord-ship. *In fine*, l, 24, blot out of their, line 25, r, my speare.

### *In the Epistle to H. Cholmley.*

Page 4, l, 1, r, *deposita* and *quarantens*, l, 4, r, one side, l, 24, r, hazzard, p, 5, l, 28, r, tremble, and reperunt.

### *To the Reader.*

Page 1, l, 27, reade my hap.

### *In the booke.*

For *Cholinley*, reade *Cholmley*, page 4, l, 10, for leane, r, leaue, p, 6, l, 16, r, bring in p, 8, l, 1, r, with thee, l, 14, r, *recipientes*, l, 17, r, to euery, p, 10, l, 11, r, spunged, p, 14, l, 6, r, quarel me, p, 15, l, 11, r, to be accidētal, l, 36, r, extēnt, p, 16, l, 12, r, *successive* ly it may, p, 20, l, 8, r, layd felony, l, 10, r, alledged, p, 21, l, 17, r, part, p, 23, l, 13, r, neuer accursed, p, 24, l, 14, r, our Church condemnes, p, 26, l, 24, r, accursed by, p, 30, l, 22, r, then reply p, 35 in the marg. r, *Necol*, p, 36, l, 11, r, to prate the like, p, 39, l, 28, r, then of the honour, p, 41, l, 3, r, for marks of, p, 44, l, 6, r, Intention, page 47, line 12, reade wherein if I must, page 48, line 16, reade know and loue the truth, p, 52, l, 34, read one of, p, 56, l, 1, reade in a weake, page 57, line 2, read at your perill, l, 28, r, put this quest. l, 31, r, dying a Papist, p, 59, l, 10, r, about him, p, 61, l, 25, r, contemne, p, 63, l, 28, r, for, the Masse, r, Hiemals, p, 64, l, 13, r, shall, if not reape more profit, p, 67, l, 19, r, warnes vs, p, 74, l, r, Thus then, p, 79, l, 7, r, my Mother, l, 25, r, of visibility, p, 80, l, 10, r, which was the signe, l, 17, r, and yet she, p, 81, l, 6, r, is but the bare, l, 27, r, Nor can you, p, 83, l, 19, 20, reade as one line, to wit, boldacesse (Mr. Burton) p, 84, r, l, 14, *phum canit*, p, 85, l, 6, r, *secundum mensuram*, p, 87, l, 19, r, he sets downe, l, 31, r, for taking, p, 90, l, 10, r, each simple l, 18, r, not infused, l, 25, r, *Pontifician*, p, 96, l, r, Councel of Trent, p, 99, l, 8, confessed euen, l, 23, r, *ista*, p, 104, l, 15, r, and deny, p, 107, l, 18, r, The cleansing, l, 19, r, In the, l, 36, r, and authentike, p, 108, l, 1, blot out all, but, Nor, l, 32, r, Apostaticall, p, 109, l, 32, r, who are made, p, 110, l, 18, r, past all peraduen. p, 131, l, 41, r, denying them to be meant, p, 114, l, 16, r, those Churches, p, 115, l, 24, r, had reserved, l, 27, in the marg. put objection 4, p, 116, l, 20, r, vnderstanding it, p, 117, l, 10, r, true visible, p, 121, l, 19, r, your zeale, l, 23, r, certified and satisfied, p, 122, l, 14, r, Sacraments. page 125 l, 15, r, is it.